

The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42,1-4 in Matthew 12

This investigation aims at continuing the conversation on the use of Isa 42,1-4 in Matthew 12⁽¹⁾. Previous discussions of Matt 12,18-21 have pointed out how the gospel uses Isa 42 to highlight several aspects of Jesus' career at this point in the narrative, which is an acceptable starting point since the text explicitly claims that Jesus is fulfilling Scripture in Matt 12,17. In general it is urged that Isa 42,1-4 illuminates several aspects of Jesus' career: (a) his compassionate miracles (v. 15) are said to be reflected in "the bruised reed/smoldering wick" which are sustained (v. 20); (b) the silence imposed on the cured (v. 16) or (c) the withdrawal from the plotting Pharisees (v. 15a) are said to be mirrored in "he will not wrangle or cry aloud" (v. 19a)⁽²⁾. Thus G. Barth's remark is representative of most of the previous discussion of the relationship of Isa 42 and Matt 12:

By means of the quotation in 12,18-21 Matthew has especially underlined the humility and lowliness of Jesus. His with-

(¹) The most recent advance in the conversation on this topic is O. LAMAR COPE's *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (CBAMS 5; Washington 1976) 32-52; J. D. KINGSBURY's small monograph (*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* [Philadelphia 1975] 94-95) made some strikingly fresh suggestions on the text as well. Although the general literature on Matthew and the fulfillment formulae is enormous, several recent articles may serve as a useful guide to the state of the question: see F. VAN SEGBROECK, "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents", and L. HARMAN, "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication", both in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu* (BETL XXIX; ed. by M. Didier; Gembloux 1972) 107-130, 131-152.

(²) These interpretations are standard fare in the commentaries; for example, see W. TRILLING, *Das wahre Israel* (Erfurter Theologische Studien 7; Leipzig 1959) 103; P. BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 1; Neuchâtel ²1970) 177-179; and K. STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 20; Lund 1954) 107-115.

drawal from the Pharisees, his command to silence, in fact his whole saving activity for the broken are signs of his lowliness, in which he proves himself the servant of God of Isa 42⁽³⁾.

Several comments are appropriate here on the thrust of these previous discussions. 1. There has been a nigh exclusive tendency to relate the citation of Isa 42 in Matt 12,18-21 only to vv. 14 and 15-16. 2. The relationship, moreover, of citation to narrative has not been established on the basis of exact verbal links, as was the case in other quotations of Isaiah in Matthew, i.e. the use of Isa 7,14 in Matt 1,20-25 or of Isa 6,9-10 in Matt 13,13-17; only reasonable thematic equivalents are pointed out. 3. The citation is said to function exclusively as a christological portrait of Jesus as the meek servant of God.

Many questions arise from this examination which suggest that the conversation on Matt 12,18-21 should continue. For instance, the text of Isaiah cited by Matthew is unnecessarily extensive, if the author's intention was to highlight just two verses from Isaiah (42, 2.3). The citation, moreover, is recognized as a specially redacted version of Isa. which does not exactly fit the MT, LXX or any other text we know of⁽⁴⁾; this careful redaction of the entire passage from Isa 42 would seem superfluous if only a few items were intended for application by Matthew. And if thematic equivalents, not explicit verbal links are the points of contact between citation and narrative, why stop with just the three mentioned above? Might not other relationships between citation and narrative also be operative? Why should the scope of the application of citation to narrative be restricted to 12,14.15-16? Furthermore, is the thrust of ch. 12 as irenic as is supposed? Even a casual scan of the text points to: a) explicit controversies (12,1-8.9-13) which provoke a death plot (v. 14); b) polemic (12,24) and apology (12,25-32); c) sentences of judgment (12,33-37) and condemnations (12,40-42); and d) a new definition of

⁽³⁾ *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (Philadelphia 1963) 128.

⁽⁴⁾ The most thorough study of the text is found in STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew*, 107-115; see also R. H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NTS XVIII; Leiden 1967) 111-116; W. ROTHFUCHS, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Mattäusevangeliums* (BWANT, ser. 5, 8; Stuttgart 1969) 72-77; J. GRINDEL, "Matthew 12, 18-20", *CBQ* 29 (1967) 110-115 and S. E. JOHNSON, "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew", *HTR* 36 (1943) 135-153.

Jesus' family after the rejection by the Jews (12,46-50). So irenic a portrait of Jesus as Barth presented seems oddly at variance with Jesus' aggressive actions and condemnatory statements in the narrative.

These questions lead me to posit a fresh hypothesis with which to continue the conversation on Matt 12,18-21. I suggest that the text of Isa 42 which is cited in Matt 12,18-21 has many points of contact with the whole narrative in Matt 12. Questions of Jesus' authority, which spirit he possesses, whether people will listen to his preaching, what judgment awaits unbelievers, what the future composition of the church will be, how Jesus is to be named — these are all reflected in the citation from Isaiah. Furthermore, the citation functions as an apology for the Matthean community in its ongoing confrontation with the synagogue: exposing plots and charges against Jesus, rendering an apology for polemical slander, issuing a condemnation on unbelief and a judgment on rejection of God's Servant. Isa 42,1-4 is intended by Matthew to illuminate the whole of the narrative in ch. 12, not just vv. 14-16. It points less to an ideal christological portrait of Jesus as the meek servant and more toward the situation of Matthew's church in conflict with the synagogue⁽⁵⁾.

II.

1. In examining the relationship of the citation of Isa 42 and Matt 12, let us begin with what appears to be an explicit verbal link⁽⁶⁾. Isa 42,1 Matt 12,18c reads: θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν; this seems to have a direct relationship with 12,24 where unbelieving Pharisees argue just the opposite: οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεεζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων (see 9,34; 11,18). The apology for this polemic is carried out in 12,25-32 (v. 28: εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια... v. 32: τοῦ πνεύματος

⁽⁵⁾ See R. HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäusevangelium* (Munich 1963) 122-127; and D. R. A. HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (SNTSMS 6; Cambridge 1967) 130-145.

⁽⁶⁾ Most commentators blithely pass over this point; yet see COPE, *A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom*, 36-39 and HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 125-127.

τοῦ ἁγίου) but it is ultimately grounded on the Christian faith that Jesus has God's spirit (see 3,16-4,1), a point insisted upon in 12,18c as well (see 1,18.20)(7). This, then, is an explicit verbal link between the text and narrative which immediately suggests that the impact of the prophetic text should not be restricted only to 12,14-16; it is, moreover, apologetic in function.

2. This first example may help to illuminate the initial phrase in Isa 42,1/Matt 12,18a where it is said of Jesus: ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. It has been pointed out that Matt. has apparently changed both the MT and LXX to bring this citation into conformity with the baptismal voice from heaven (3,16) and with the heavenly voice at the transfiguration (17,5)(8). These three citations in Matt. are the foundation of the church's faith in Jesus as God's authorized one, his *ἡλιος* (9). The repetition of this authorization is evidently important in ch. 12 where Jesus claims extraordinary authority to pronounce halachic judgments on Sabbath observance (12,8.12). It is important that Christian faith in Jesus as God's designated one be apologetically affirmed. The apology in ch. 12 rests on what God has to say about Jesus, the Pharisees' verdict notwithstanding. So Jesus is God's chosen one (v. 18) on whom God has put the Spirit (v. 18b), which Spirit he exercises in his ministry (v. 28). One might go so far to say that the apology in ch. 12 is not unlike a passion apologetic: the hostile Jews are given the sign of Jonah. As Jonah was rescued from seeming death out of the whale's belly, so will the Son of Man be rescued by God from death (v. 40). God's verdict about Jesus, then, serves as an important apologetic response to the hostility of the Pharisees(10).

3. Isa 42,2/Matt 12,19b reads: οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. The MT here suggests that the servant

(7) See J. D. KINGSBURY, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 95; B. LINDARS, *New Testament Apologetic* (London 1961) 145-146, 151.

(8) See STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew*, 110-111; GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 112; and KINGSBURY, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 95.

(9) KINGSBURY, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 95 calls attention to the theological thrust of v. 18; see also ROTHFUCHS, *Erfüllungszitate*, 123.

(10) See HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 125-127.

himself purposely restrains his voice and causes it not to be heard, which in the LXX is more neutrally rendered: οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνῇ αὐτοῦ⁽¹¹⁾. But Matt's version is still more curiously rendered in a direction which points less to the speaker's plan *not* to be heard and more to rejection by the hearers themselves. Quite literally Matt 12,19b reads "no one will listen to his voice in the streets". Who in ch. 12 is "not listening to his voice"?

Twice in ch. 12 a schism⁽¹²⁾ among seers/hearers of Jesus is recorded. In 12,41-42 we are told that some listen and others refuse to hear the voice of God's messengers. Pagans (Ninevites and the Queen of the South) listened respectively to Jonah's preaching and to Solomon's wisdom; and they are contrasted with the Scribes and Pharisees who are clearly *not* listening to "greater than Jonah" or "greater than Solomon". Some people, then, are wilfully refusing to listen to the voice of God's messengers. And in 12,22-24 we find a similar schism presented. Jesus heals a blind/dumb demoniac (v. 22) and this leads some to remark favorably of Jesus: "Can this be the Son of David?" (v. 23). But the Pharisees reject Jesus' signs and credentials, claiming that he is possessed of Satan (v. 24). Belief vs unbelief — clearly some are *not* listening to his voice.

It is important to see this material in the context of Matthew's gospel at this point in the narrative. The evangelist has been repeatedly pointing out the rejection of Jesus by the Jews: in 11,16-19 both Jesus and John are rejected by "this generation", which rejection leads to a formal condemnation of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum because they did not repent at the eloquent works of Jesus the prophet (11,20-24). Likewise in 13,14-15 the failure of the crowd to believe is explained by the citation of Isa 6,9-10, emphasizing their deaf ears which refuse to hear. Thus in 11,16-19,20-24; 12,24,41-42 and 13,14-15 Matthew repeatedly points out the fact that many, especially Pharisees, "do not listen to his voice". Thus Matt 12,19b/Isa 42,2 is literally and most abundantly fulfilled in ch. 12; it functions, moreover, as an apologetic for the Christian gospel vis-

⁽¹¹⁾ See STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew*, 113.

⁽¹²⁾ D. R. A. HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians*, 134-137, calls this "the rejection motif" and links it with numerous other references in the gospel to Jewish rejection of Jesus. The argument in ch. 12, however, is not just that there is rejection but contrasting reactions to Jesus; see also HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 118-119, 123-125.

à-vis Jewish unbelief and hostility. That Israel has a habit of rejecting God's messengers is verified twice by Isaiah, first in 12,18-21 (Isa 42,1-4) and again in 13,14-15 (Isa 6,9-10).

This analysis, moreover, suggests that the career of Jesus which is said to fulfill the prophecy of Isa 42 is not simply restricted to Matt 12. We noted above how the motifs of ch. 12 are found also in chs. 11 and 13; for example: a) rejection of God's prophets was recounted in 11,16-19 and 13,13-15, b) judgment was pronounced on unbelievers in 11,20-24 and in 13,30.39-43 and 47-50, and c) Jesus as God's chosen one is reflected in the exclusive position of the Son vis-à-vis the Father in 11,27.

4. Isa 42,1/Matt 12,18b reads καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. This seems to imply that the beloved son on whom God's spirit rests is commissioned to preach God's word. Matt. has apparently changed the LXX here from κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει to ἀπαγγελεῖ, a redactional change which calls attention to the preaching mission of the servant⁽¹³⁾. Thus 12,18d implies that the servant will be actively engaged in a speaking ministry. The meaning of κρίσις is notoriously difficult to determine, whether it means preaching gospel/true religion or an imminent judgment⁽¹⁴⁾. In either case, however, it implies an active speaking ministry.

Matt's text says more: κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. In Matthew ἀπαγγέλλειν is usually associated with heralding the good news about Jesus (2,8; 8,33; 11,4; 28,8.10.11). Is there a hint here that the Gentiles will hear and receive the gospel about Jesus, which will contrast them with the unbelieving Pharisees who "do not hear his voice"? In 12,41-42 it is pointed out that the pagan Ninevites were evangelized by Jonah and that the pagan Queen of the South "heard the wisdom of Solomon"; these Gentiles, moreover, judge "this evil and adulterous generation" for they listened to God's messengers but the Jews do not. The word, therefore, is being heralded. Gentile

⁽¹³⁾ STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew*, 111; see also LINDARS, *New Testament Apologetic*, 147: yet others insist on the servant's silence, see BARTH, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 126.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, 178; A. H. MCNEILE, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London 1955) 172; E. SCHWEIZER, *The Good News According to Matthew* (Atlanta 1975) 282; BARTH, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 141; W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 1; Berlin 1968) 326; and COPE, *A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom*, 42-43.

acceptance and Jewish rejection are probably reflected also in the episode which concludes the narrative in ch. 12, where comment is made on Jesus' true family⁽¹⁵⁾. "Who is my mother, brothers?" ethnic cousins? blood relatives? same nation? Jesus' family is much broader, for it includes everyone who does God's will, which most basically is to receive the one whom God has sent (see 10,40). This implies that the messenger of God is heralding God's word.

5. The speaking character of the servant's mission, however, is seemingly contradicted by another verse in the citation which reads οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγᾶσει (Matt 12,19a/Isa 42,1). Traditionally 12,19a has been taken to mean just the opposite of v. 18b, viz., either that Jesus withdraws from his adversaries (see 12,15) or that he does not speak, certainly not to engage in controversy and polemics. Commentators never tire of stressing the negative character of what the servant of God does (οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγᾶσει... οὐ κατεάξει... οὐ σβέσει)⁽¹⁶⁾. And so the impression is given that Jesus is meek and silent.

But there are problems connected with this view. 1. Mt 12,19a literally says nothing about withdrawal from controversy. 2. While it makes reference to speech, it does not say flat out that the servant is silent. 3. Commentators have seized upon and made capital of 12,19a, but have virtually neglected 12,18b. 4. And so there is no sense of the tension in the very citation of Isaiah which on the one hand describes the servant as speaking (see v. 18b) and people as refusing to hear his voice (v. 19b) and on the other hand states that the servant does not wrangle or cry aloud (v. 19a). The citation, then, contains conflicting statements about the servant: he speaks but he does not cry aloud; he announces judgment but he does not wrangle. What aspects of the citation does Matthew pick up on? The answer must

(15) COPE, *A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom*, 45, links vv. 46-50 with the Isaiah text, but not in the sense that I have argued. He stresses the fact that in Isa 42 Jesus is proclaimed as "my Son" and in the final pericope Jesus proclaims God as "my Father". I am arguing that the link is more formally made between the final inclusion of all who believe (vv. 46-50) and the text of Isaiah where the ἔθνη will be evangelized.

(16) Typical in this regard is BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, 178.

come from a continuous conversation on the relationship of the citation to its narrative context.

6. One line of investigation suggests that we follow out the implications of κρίσις in 12,18d and 20c and in the rest of ch. 12. Isa 42,3/Matt 12,20c further describes the servant's mission in terms of κρίσις: ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν⁽¹⁷⁾. Κρίσις, therefore, is integral to the servant's mission. Although there is nothing in the first half of ch. 12 which explains this, the rest of ch. 12 is particularly rich in this material. In 12,41-42 a judgment scene is described in which Gentiles who listened to God's messengers and repented will "arise in judgment with this generation". The Ninevites and the Queen of the South accepted God's word and messengers but the Scribes and Pharisees do not. Judgment is likewise proclaimed in 12,36 against the unbelieving Pharisees, that "brood of vipers". They have rejected Jesus as God's messenger and charged him with being possessed by Satan (v. 24); this is related to the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in vv. 31-32, which is said to be unforgivable and so is certain to come under harsh judgment⁽¹⁸⁾. And 12,33-37 follow up the Pharisees' polemical "speech" against Jesus by threatening that they "will account for every word on the day of judgment" (v. 36), surely not everyday speech, but what is confessed about Jesus or what is calumniously charged against him. On the basis of this confessional "speech" judgment will be rendered: "by your words you will be justified and by your words you will be condemned" (v. 37). 12,37, moreover, is identical with the judgment pronounced in the missionary discourse in ch. 10 where we were told that "everyone who acknowledges me before men I will also acknowledge before my Father" but "whoever denies me before men I will also deny before my Father" (10,32-33). There is no doubt that Jesus acts as judge in ch. 12 to condemn the "brood of vipers" who call him possessed (12,24.31-32) and who blindly demand a sign (12,38-42). And he will hold unbelievers accountable for unbelief and for calumny against him (12,34-37).

There is one further instance of judgment in ch. 12. These same Pharisees will have another judge, "their sons". For if, ac-

(17) For a fuller discussion of εἰς νίκος, see GRINDEL, "Matthew 12, 18-20", 113-115.

(18) See MCNEILE, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 178-179.

cording to the Pharisees, Jesus casts out demons by Beelzeboul, by whom do Jewish exorcists cast them out? By the power of God, surely. And so their sons cast judgment on the error of the Pharisees (12,27).

In summary then, although there is nothing in the first half of ch. 12 which directly relates to 12,18d and 20c, there is considerable material in 12,22-50 which seems to serve as Matthew's understanding of how those two verses of Isa. are to be interpreted. Contrary to negative announcements in 12,19a, the servant is commissioned to speak, to engage actively, to herald the gospel, and to judge. The judgment which the servant announces means two things: a) the hearers (Jew and Gentile) are confronted with God's word and must make a decision, a judgment in belief or unbelief (see John 3,17-19) and so we find numerous examples of conflicting judgments about Jesus (12,22-24.41-42.46-50). And b) unbelievers are judged for their wrong judgment, their unbelief (12,41-42), for their unforgivable sin (12,30-32), for their calumny against Jesus (12,33-37). Hence the servant who "announces judgment" is dramatized in Jesus who actively engages in polemic and judgment, contrary to what v. 19a stated. Whatever one thinks of οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κρῶνγάσει, Jesus is nevertheless engaged in aggressive polemics against the "brood of vipers", the "wicked and adulterous generation⁽¹⁹⁾".

7. Isa 42,4/Matt 12,21 tells us καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιουσιν. While there is no specific reference in ch. 12 to ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, there is a surprising plethora of christological titles and identifications in the narrative. Jesus is proclaimed as "Son of Man" (12,8.21.40), "Son of David" (12,23), "Servant" (12,18), the greater one — "greater than the temple" (12,6), than Jonah (12,41), than Solomon (12,42). And in virtue of the familiar citation of Isa 42,1, he is surely "Son of God" (see 3,16-17; 17,5). The plethora of titles, etc., does not admit a judgment on which one is preferred at this point in the narrative⁽²⁰⁾; what is important is some confession in faith about Jesus as God's messenger. For this is the "speech" by which one will be judged (12,35-36).

Are the ἔθνη in 12,18d and 21 exclusively Gentiles? Could

⁽¹⁹⁾ On the redactional character of these verses see HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians*, 82, 87.

⁽²⁰⁾ Yet see KINGSBURY, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 94-95.

ἔθνη refer to an inclusive missionary thrust which would embrace Jews and Gentiles⁽²¹⁾? Inasmuch as some Jews are confessing Jesus as "Son of David" (12,23; see 21,9.15), it seems inaccurate to argue that ἔθνη means only Gentiles. Rather the term seems to reflect a complex of ideas: a) a universal mission to many peoples and b) perhaps a note on how the Gentiles will be evangelized as replacements for the unbelieving Jews (see 21,40-41; 22,8-10)⁽²²⁾. But ἔθνη suggests, at the very least, what Matthew has seen all along in Isaiah's prophecy about the Scriptural warrant for a mission to the Gentiles (see Matt 4,15-16). And there seems to be an apologetic flavor in the references to believing Gentiles in 12,41-42 which suggests that the mention of ἔθνη is controversial in tone and so belongs to the polemic against the Jews in ch. 12.

8. One final item remains to be examined. Isa 42,3/Matt 12,20c reports: ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν. The verb ἐκβάλλειν occurs in two places in ch. 12: a) οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεεζεβοὺλ... (12,24-28), and b) ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθὰ καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά (12,35). Is this an intentional link or a coincidental reoccurrence of the verb⁽²³⁾? First it should be noted that Matthew's version of Isa 42,3 differs from LXX and other text types (εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν); and his rendering of 12,35 does not match the Lucan parallel of this saying precisely in terms of the verb used (ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ *προφέρει*... ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ *προφέρει*, Luke 6,45). The change in the citation of Isa 42,3 and Q/Luke 6,45 made by inserting ἐκβάλλειν would seem superfluous unless it is assumed that the author thereby intended some linkage between these statements. 12,24-32 and 33-37 are thematically linked by their common apology to the calumnious speech of the Pharisees in v. 24. To the charge about Jesus (ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεεζεβοὺλ) Matthew responds with an apology in 12,26-28 which

(21) D.R.A. HARE and D. J. HARRINGTON, "Make Disciples of All the Gentiles" (Matt 28:19), *CBQ* 37 (1975) 362.

(22) HARE and HARRINGTON, "Make Disciples of All the Gentiles", 367; see also HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecutions of Christians*, 80-129 and J. MEIER, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28,19"? *CBQ* 39 (1977) 95 and 100.

(23) See STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew*, 114; also J. GRINDEL, "Matthew 12, 18-21", 112-113.

correctly explains the truth of Jesus' exorcisms, in which verses the term ἐκβάλλει figures prominently: a) εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη (v. 26), b) εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοῦλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν (v. 27), and c) εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 28). And in a polemic against slanderous speech (i.e., to claim that Jesus casts out [ἐκβάλλει] demons by Beelzeboul), Matthew retorts with a principle of judgment based on whether good or evil speech is brought forth (see ἐκβάλλει, 12,35). The link with 12,20c is basically linguistic (*Stichwort*) but also thematic, for God has so authorized Jesus to have the Holy Spirit and to exercise that power, Pharisaic polemic notwithstanding.

III.

As we conclude this conversation on Matt 12, what are we to make of the popular claims that the text of Isa 42 reflects both Jesus' miracles (cf. "bruised reed/smoldering wick") and his withdrawal from controversy ("no one will hear his voice")?

The argument that Jesus' miracles are alluded to in the citation of Isa 42 has much to recommend it⁽²⁴⁾. The citation itself is bracketed by reports of Jesus' healings (vv. 15 and 22) which suggests that Isaiah's text has something to say to its immediate context in ch. 12, which is that of healing. The early part of the chapter, in fact, is taken up both with Jesus' healing (vv. 9-13) and his actions of kindness in feeding the hungry (vv. 1-8). A third argument comes from the observation in Matt 8,17. There Jesus' messianic healings are interpreted *via* a text of Isaiah (53,4)⁽²⁵⁾. The healing Servant/Son of David, moreover, is an important element in Matthew's christology⁽²⁶⁾. The phrase about "the bruised reed/smolder-

⁽²⁴⁾ See TRILLING, *Das wahre Israel*, 103; GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 325; and BARTH, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, 126-128.

⁽²⁵⁾ See D. HILL, "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology", *JSNT* 6 (1980) 9.

⁽²⁶⁾ See, for example, J. D. KINGSBURY, "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602; D. DULING, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic", *NTS* 24 (1978) 392-410; and C. BURGER, *Jesus als Davidsohn. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (FRLANT 98; Göttingen 1970) 74-79.

ing wick", therefore, is judged to refer to the miracles of Jesus in 12,9-13.15.22⁽²⁷⁾.

But we are advised by our previous analysis to take a closer look at claims that the Isaiah citation interprets Jesus either as withdrawing from controversy or as imposing a type of messianic secret. 12,15-16 explicitly state two things: a) Jesus healed many (v. 15) and b) he ordered those cured "not to make him known" (v. 16). It is evident that the healings are reflected in 12,20; but is the material in v. 16 also reflected in the citation? If so, it is mirrored in v. 19a, οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδε κραυγᾷσει.

Yet there are many problems attendant upon this reading of vv. 16 and 19a. First, it is doubtful if Matthew is all that interested in Mark's messianic secret. The Matthean omissions of Markan secrecy material are quite striking: a) the silencing of demons (Mark 1,24.34) is omitted by Matthew; b) the silencing of a healed man (Mark 7,36) is omitted in Matt 15,30-31; c) a whole miracle, including a command to silence (Mark 8,22-26) is omitted by Matthew; and d) Jesus' desire to remain hidden (Mark 7,24) is omitted in Matt 15,21. Matthew kept only three instances of Mark's command to silence: a) two healings (Mark 1,44/Matt 8,4; Mark 3,12/Matt 12,16) and b) one confession (Mark 8,30/Matt 16,20). The weight of this evidence suggests that Matthew was minimally interested in a messianic secret, if at all; the omissions argue that he was downgrading it; he added nothing in this vein to the Markan source.

Second, if secrecy is even a minor Matthean motif in 12,15-16 (and hence in 12,19a), it is contradicted by the very context of this passage in which miracles are intentionally public, not private. 12,9-13.22-24 both record public healings which intentionally provoke reactions of acceptance or rejection. Healings, then, serve to elicit reactions; hence they are public. If we are expected to take seriously the secrecy imposed in v. 16 as a conscious thematic motif, then that verse stands in considerable tension with the publicity intentionally accorded to the healings in 12,9-13 and 22-24.

The literal sense of 12,19a, moreover, does not favor a secrecy motif, for the verbs ἐρίσει and κραυγᾷσει allude to forensic contro-

⁽²⁷⁾ HILL, "Son and Servant", 12, would extend the symbolism of his verse even further, to include the "harrassed and helpless" (9,36) and "those who labour and are heavy laden" (11,28).

versy. K. Stendahl argues that we should take them in the sense of "to contend" and "to strive", terms that might favor a forensic interpretation, but hardly a silence motif⁽²⁸⁾.

Might 12,19a, then, favor a withdrawal-from-controversy motif, such as is stated in 12,15, "he withdrew from there"? But v. 19a has nothing to do with locomotion. Nor does the text of the Isaiah citation cited in 12,18-21 imply such a low profile of the Lord's servant. Matt 12,15 speaks of withdrawal from the Pharisees who are plotting "how to destroy him" (v. 14), a statement probably in accord with the traditional logion which states that prophets suffer in Jerusalem (23,37-38/Luke 13,34-35); and so the passion plot must be suspended until 26,3-5. Withdrawal in the face of a death plot perhaps, but total withdrawal from all controversy hardly accords with Jesus' aggressive public posture in 12,1-8.9-13 or with his public apology to the Pharisees' polemic in 12,25-32 or with his judgment on their "false speech" in 12,33-37 or with his condemnation of them in 12,39-42. Withdrawal, then, is confined only to the narrative note in v. 15 and there it literally refers to avoidance of a death plot, not of all controversy. And since it is so positively contradicted by the bulk of Matthew's redactional changes in ch. 12, we doubt whether it is formally replicated in the text of Isaiah in 12,19a.

What then of 12,19a? If it seems unlikely that v. 19a refers to a messianic secret or to withdrawal from controversy, what then? Is it a piece of text useless to Matthew? Perhaps not. In 12,38 certain of the Scribes and Pharisees confront Jesus and demand a sign, a forensic gesture demanding a public defense of Jesus' identity and credentials. But Jesus refuses them their sign: "an evil and adulterous generation seeks a sign; but no sign will be given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah" (v. 39). Because the opponents are called "an evil and adulterous generation", it would seem clear that such a request is perceived as an act of rejection and unbelief. This is made clear in a similar passage in Matt 16,1-4 where the request for a sign is considered as a trap (πειράζοντες ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδείξαι αὐτοῖς, 16,1). The reply there is a judgment on their refusal to read the signs of the time (v. 3) and a refusal to give any sign but the sign of

⁽²⁸⁾ *The School of St. Matthew*, 111.

Jonah (v. 4). These two passages suggest that Jesus will emphatically *not* engage in forensic debate with his enemies over his credentials and his identity. His miracles alone are signs enough; no further debate or contest is necessary.

Hence, Isa 42,2/Matt 12,19a states that in his own behalf the servant of God refuses to engage in forensic apology for his credentials or his identity: οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάζει. The servant does not refuse to speak in general: he announces God's message, he pronounces judgment. But he refuses to give signs beyond his miracles, and he refuses to defend his authorization. As Isa 42,1/Matt 12,18 indicates, God has authorized his servant, Jesus; and so, only God can give an appropriate sign, the sign of Jonah, which he will do when he raises Jesus from the dead. But the "chosen one of God" will *not* himself "contend or strive" in a forensic debate with his enemies over his identity or his credentials.

The link, therefore, between the narrative (12,15-16) and the citation (12,18-21) seems to favor only the reference to the miracles in vv. 15,20. The evidence presented strongly suggests that Matthew was neither interested in a messianic secret (v. 16) nor in withdrawal from all controversy. Hence it is problematic to say that v. 19a is consciously intended to pick up either motif. Nor is there any need to so argue, for the connection between narrative and citation is adequately established in the link between the healings in v. 15 and the text of Isaiah in v. 20.

IV.

Matthew's intention to present Jesus as vocally and aggressively apologetic is confirmed by reflection upon the redaction of ch. 12. The basic strands of traditions in Mt 12 are the Markan *Vorlage* (Mark 2,23-3,35) and Q materials (Luke 11,14-32) which are interwoven by the evangelist to give us the series of episodes as we now read the text. (See p. 473). What this means is that the Markan text, which records a) public controversies (2,23-28; 3,1-6), b) polemical charges and apologetic responses (3,22-30), c) and contrasts between believers and unbelievers (3,20-21.30-35), is interlaced with Q materials which likewise portray a) a hostile confrontation (11,29-30), b) a judgment on unbelief (11,31-32), and c) a counter charge of demon possession (11,24-26). Both Mark and Q portray Jesus as *not* avoiding controversy, polemic, and condemnation. The

shaping of these sources into a coherent narrative at this point in Matthew's gospel argues that the evangelist's intent lies in the direction of presenting an extensive conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, a full airing of the polemical charges, and an apologetic answer, which includes strong judgment⁽²⁹⁾. If omission of conflict is the evangelist's intent, then we should be genuinely confused by the redactional addition of "brood of vipers" to 12,34 (not in Q, at this point) and of "an evil and adulterous generation" to 12,39. Withdrawal from conflict, therefore, does not appear to be the evangelist's redactional intent in the shaping of ch. 12.

V.

The phrases in the extended citation from Isa 42 which I have brought forth suggest a portrait of Jesus and a description of the church's situation quite different from the popular impression of Jesus as "meek servant". Let us pull these threads together and see what pattern they are weaving. Jesus' contested authority, which spirit he has, the scandal that no one will listen to his voice, the judgment on unbelievers, the extension of the gospel to all nations and the name in which they will hope—these elements in Matt's citation of Isa 42,1-4 point to a portrait of Jesus who is the very center of controversy and judgment. The text, moreover, functions in an extended polemical context, answering calumny, defending the Christian confession, judging unbelief and condemning hostile charges against Jesus⁽³⁰⁾. The situation suggested in this view reflects the bitter controversy between Matthew's church and the unbelieving, hostile Pharisees, i.e. a portrait of the evangelist's time and experience.

The eight items in the Isaiah citation which I have identified, moreover, are the sum and substance of the events in ch. 12. These are not esoteric items capriciously lifted from Matt 12,18-21 but are major thematic statements in the episodes recorded in the narrative of chs. 11–13. The following synopsis is intended

⁽²⁹⁾ The controversy context of ch. 12 which forms the setting of the citation of Isa 42 is well treated by GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 324-325.

⁽³⁰⁾ The refutation and debate character of 12,22-45 is well treated in HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 125-128.

to suggest the scope of the broad correspondence between the citation of Isa 42 and the text of Matthew:

| <i>Isa 42/Matt 12,18-21</i> | <i>Matthew 12</i> |
|---|--|
| 1. God's commissioning ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου (v. 18a,b) | 12,8.28.40 11,27 |
| 2. Whose spirit? θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ αὐτόν (v. 18c) | 12,24.25-32.43-45 |
| 3. Believers, especially Gentiles καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ (v. 18d) | 12,41-42.46-50 |
| 4. Refusal to give a sign οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει (v. 19a) | 12,38-39 |
| 5. Refusal to hear οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ (v. 19b) | 12,38-42 11,16-19; 13,13-15 |
| 6. Healing role of the Servant κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει (v. 20a,b) | 12,9-13.15.22 |
| 7. Judgment upon unbelievers ὥς ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν (v. 20c) | 12,31-32.33-37.41-42 11,20-24; 13,39-43.47-50 |
| 8. Names of God's Servant καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν (v. 21) | 12,8.23.31-32.40 |

The chapter, moreover, centers around diverse reactions to Jesus, whereby faith is contrasted with unbelief (12,23-24.41-42 and 46-50). And one of Matthew's additions to the Markan passage in 12,25-32 is highly significant in this regard. The logion in 12,30, "who is not with me is against me; who does not gather with me scatters", underscores the radical choice that is set before the audience of Jesus. The whole chapter, then, speaks to the crisis hearers face before the preaching of Jesus and the church. One's judgment about Jesus is to be measured according to God's judgment as found in Isa 42. Woe betide the one who disagrees with God!

Weston School of Theology
3 Phillips Place
Cambridge, MA 02138
U. S. A.

Jerome H. NEYREY, S. J.

Source Analysis of Matthew 12

| <i>Matthew 12</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Source</i> |
|-------------------|--|------------------|
| 1-8 | sabbath controversy | Mark 2,23-28 |
| 9-14 | sabbath controversy | Mark 3,1-6 |
| 15 | withdrawal, healing summary | Mark 3,7.10 |
| 16 | silence imposed on those healed | Mark 3,11-12 |
| 17-21 | Isaiah citation | |
| 22-24 | schism among Jews over Jesus' healing | Luke 11,14-16 |
| 24.25-29 | charge that Jesus is possessed | Mark 3,22.23-27 |
| | and defense against charge | Luke 11,15.17-22 |
| 30 | either with Jesus or against him | Luke 11,23 |
| 31-32 | the ultimate sin: to say that Jesus is possessed | Mark 3,28-30 |
| 33-35 | bad speech from a bad heart | Luke 6,43-45 |
| 36-37 | judgment according to speech | |
| 38-39 | demand for a sign | 11,16.29-30 |
| 40 | Jonah 3 days and nights in the whale's belly | |
| 41-42 | believing pagans judge unbelieving Jews | Luke 11,31-32 |
| 43-45 | repossessed by seven new demons | Luke 11,24-26 |
| 46-50 | the new family of Jesus | Mark 3,31-35 |

SOMMAIRE

La relation entre la citation d'Is 42 et le texte de Mt 12 n'est pas limitée à la note sur les miracles (vv. 15-16) et à l'expression "roseau brisé/mèche fumante" (v. 20). En outre, la question de l'autorité de Jésus (vv. 18/8.28.40), de l'esprit qu'il possède (vv. 18c/24.25-32.43-45), sa prédication, spécialement aux païens (vv. 18d/41-42.46-50), son refus de donner un signe (vv. 19a/38-39), le rejet de sa prédication (vv. 19b/38-42) et le jugement des non-croyants sont des motifs de la citation qui forment aussi des thèmes majeurs du chap. 12. La citation, par conséquent, ne présente pas un portrait de l'humble serviteur, mais plutôt dépeint Jésus comme centre de controverses, polémiques et jugements. Ce portrait reflète la situation de l'Église de l'évangéliste dans sa continuelle polémique contre la synagogue.

Mark's Technique: the Haemorrhaging Woman and Jairus' Daughter

Mark 5,21-43 gives seemingly unnecessary detail which Matthew and Luke omit. Why? And why does this pericope appear where it does? The commentaries⁽¹⁾ provide as good as no answers. Once it was thought that the Marcan detail proved the presence of reminiscence. This is usually denied, though there is doubt how much Mark himself contributed⁽²⁾. Could the complex story-building which I shall describe have had no foundation in reminiscence? The circumstances of both cases must have been known to tradition, or the double-meanings and allusions are written in sand. The Old Testament is most certainly helpful in understanding the New; and the alleged Hellenistic intrusion into the process has been exaggerated and misunderstood.

(¹) Whether Matthew had a shorter or other source parallel to Mark's is not approached here, since the question arises from the assumption either of Matthaean priority (which I cannot use at present), or that Matthew needed some alternative source to justify his shortening Mark. If my hypothesis is correct Mark's detail can be explained (and justified) by a use of scripture which Matthew could have dispensed with. The commentaries of the last decades presume that Mark neither keeps step with the Old Testament nor relies upon the preacher's verbal familiarity with it. This applies equally to V. TAYLOR, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London 1963), E. HAENCHEN, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin ²1968), and the dragnet method of R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium*, I (Freiburg i.B. 1976). It applies to 'Introductions'. The work of Goulder will be found to proceed on other lines. The best study of Jairus' Daughter is G. ROCHAIS, *Les récits de résurrection des morts dans le Nouveau Testament* (Cambridge 1981) 39-112. H. VAN DER LOOS, *The Miracles of Jesus* (Leiden 1968) 509-519 (Woman), 567-573 (Girl) is of much utility.

(²) ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 62-63. H. W. KUHN, *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium* (Göttingen 1971) gives (27 n. 98) a list of those who believe Mk 4,35-5,43 is a pre-Markan catena; so K. KERTELGE, *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium* (Munich 1970) 110. See n. 84 below.

Admitting the presence of Old Testament allusions, did that 'background' stimulate Jesus' adventures; or were they read into them afterwards? Here we have a chance to find out. Mark, if not his predecessor(s), found the relevance of a passage in Habakkuk (which we should have expected) and of other peculiar passages in the prophets (which we should not). It is the fruit of pious 'research' into the tradition; it is impossible that Jesus could have designed his activities in order to 'fulfil' those passages: but it is another matter how far he was aware of them.

The Factual Problems

A. *The Woman*

It is mistaken to suppose that it does not matter what was wrong with her⁽³⁾. Unless we can conjecture this we cannot tell whether it was relevant or not! It is certainly true that the healing stories are not told in order to provide a list of the precise illnesses from which Jesus supplied cures. They are *not* a mini-case-book! Faith-history had already determined what features were relevant, since the mere secular history of healings did not illuminate the pious: it did not explain *what was going on*. The symbolic significance of *loss of blood* is present whether that loss was dramatic or trifling on any occasion⁽⁴⁾. This particular instance of loss of blood is the one chosen to cover all cases. It will be remembered that in all ancient cultures menstruation is harmful/vital magic; and if one can deal with females' blood one has dealt with a tremendous area of magic. Of this we must not lose sight; though there is a great deal more.

She could indeed have been troubled for *twelve years* (v. 25), and this may go back to reminiscence, yet the numeral could be

⁽³⁾ Medical authors are quick to enquire. R. and M. HENGEL, "Die Heilungen Jesu und medizinisches Denken", *Medicus Viator* (FS. R. Siebeck; Tübingen — Stuttgart 1959) 331ff. VAN DER LOOS is rightly interested in the possible factual backgrounds. But HENGEL, *ibid.*, thought it unnecessary to enquire (340) whether the Woman's complaint was hysterical. It is not to be excluded from relevance or from possibility.

⁽⁴⁾ K. GRAYSTON, "Ἰλάσκεσθαι", *NTS* 27 (1980) 640-656 at 642 (Lev 12,7).

derived from v. 42, where it is important, and may be intended to make the two females one combined sufferer for the purposes of the story⁽⁵⁾. The two are indeed linked, partly in order to demonstrate LXX Ps 62,8-9 (ὅτι ἐγενήθη βοήθός μου καὶ ἐν τῇ σκέπῃ τῶν πτερόγων σου ἀγαλλιάσομαι. ἐκολλήθη [cf. Gen 2,24; 34,3; 1 Kgs 11,2] ἡ ψυχὴ μου ὀπίσω σου, ἐμοῦ ἀντελάβετο ἡ δεξιὰ σου), and partly because Mark (it seems) decided to set the whole pericope within a framework of reference set up by Canticles and Ruth. In any event we gather that the Woman's complaint was of *long continuance* (Deut 28,59), and the true Healer was needed (Sir 38,9-15). She seeks the healing of his wings (Mal 3,20 ἱασις ἐν ταῖς πτέρουσιν [kenāfeyhā]).

Mark has presented the Woman's tale in such a way that *at first sight* she appears to be suffering from menorrhagia, and this is the common opinion⁽⁶⁾. The usefulness of this presentation to Mark, and generally, is very great. Preachers found the allusion to *impure discharges* most helpful⁽⁷⁾. Yet ῥύσις αἵματος, which is where Mark started, as we do, can refer to many kinds of bleeding, including nose-bleed⁽⁸⁾! There are reasons for hesitation: and this must be

⁽⁵⁾ So J. SUNDWALL followed by KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 201-202; KERTELGE, *Wunder*, 112; ROCHAS, *Récits*, 59-60. Unlike Bultmann, M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen ¹1933) 68-69 saw the two stories closely woven together; but even he claimed that the meaning of the 'twelve' was obviously lost. The combination of the two stories was obtusely denied by A. EDERSHEIM, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, I (London 1906) 617.

⁽⁶⁾ For the medical writer ADER see n. 18. L. CAPPELUS ad Mark 5,29 (*Criticorum Sacrorum*, VI [London 1660] 993), citing Lev 12,7; 20,18. R. MEAD, *Medical Works*, III (London 1765) ch. 11, p. 205 (gr. Heaton, see my n. 24); HENGEL, *Heilungen*, 338; VAN DER LOOS, *Miracles*, 509-10 listing opinions especially SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in medic. Beleuchtung* 18 (not available to me). The story of the statue (on which see J. C. SUICERUS, *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, I [Amsterdam ¹1728], s.v. αἰμορροῦσα) would be very odd if she were known to have had piles. Statues relating to female fertility are intelligible, and folk-credulity may well attach itself to statues of unknown origin.

⁽⁷⁾ PS. MACARIUS AEG., *Homil.* XX. 4 (PG 34.652): πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἔχουσα τὸ ἀνίατον τραῦμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας... The passage belongs to the 5th-6th centuries?

⁽⁸⁾ HIPPI., *Aph.* 327; *Aër.* 4.30; *Coac.* 86, 110; ARISTOBUL. at *Strabo* XV 1.45 (LCL VII, 78); ARISTOTLE, *De gen. animal.* 727 a 13-14. He deals with many kinds of αἰμόρροια at *De part. animal.* 668 b 15.

intentional. A clue is given by her exhausting her resources (her being reduced to poverty is important): and this means that she is to be presumed a *femme seule*, a widow or a divorcee. Jews made, as they still do⁽⁹⁾, a tabu of the menstrual condition. Interference with her availability for sexual intercourse or fertility would produce a divorce or prevent her remarriage. A further clue is Mark's⁽¹⁰⁾ insistence that her complaint was a μᾶστιξ, which implies a divine punishment⁽¹¹⁾. Menorrhagia surely could be a divine punishment, but it is not listed as such. A very much less dramatic, though very much more painful, loss of blood on a continuing basis cannot be excluded from the case, and it is documented as a biblical μᾶστιξ⁽¹²⁾: this is hemorrhoids. These, in the acute prolapsed state, certainly produce a ῥύσις αἵματος⁽¹³⁾. More than one scholar has guessed that that was her complaint⁽¹⁴⁾, probably because a charismatic cure is much more easily visualised in the case of piles than of a menstrual disorder⁽¹⁵⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ C. BERMANT, *The Walled Garden. The Saga of Jewish Family Life and Tradition* (New York 1975) ch. 8.

⁽¹⁰⁾ The word is gratuitously inserted at 29, and appended to give a false climax at 34 (a repetition of ἵσταται etc.). So D.-A. KOCH, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (Berlin — New York 1975) 136. μᾶστιξ is *makkā* or *nega*.

⁽¹¹⁾ So HENGEL, *Heilungen*, 339. LXX Pss 37,18-19; 88,33; 90,10; Prov 3,12; Jer 5,3,6-7 (?); Tob 13,2; Jdt 8,27; Ps. Sol. 7,9; 10,1-2; Sir 22,6; 23,11; 40,9-10; 2 Macc 9,11; Symm. Prov 6,3; Aquila and Symm. Isa 28,15; Heb 12,6. Cf. Apoc. Hen. Gr. 10,22; 22,11; 25,6; 100,13 (bis); 1 Clem 17,5; 22,8. Sent to encourage *confession* (2 Macc 7,37-38). Not necessarily persecution from the devil (as J. KALLAS, *The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles* [Greenwich Conn. 1961] 79-80).

⁽¹²⁾ Deut 28,27; 1 Sam 5,6.9.12.

⁽¹³⁾ HIPPOCRATES, *Aph.* 3.30, etc. (αἰμορροΐς), *Epid.* 4.7 (αἰμορροΐς). Hippocrates' treatise on hemorrhoids, *Op.* (Littre), VI (Amsterdam 1849/1962). On hemorrhoids see ARIST., *Hist. animal.* 521 a 15. Hemorrhoids suggest failure of menses, for they cause catamenia to deteriorate (?): ARIST., *Hist. animal.* 521 1 29-30; *De generat. animal.* 727 a 13-16.

⁽¹⁴⁾ GUALTHERUS cited by M. POLUS, *Synopsis Criticorum*, IV (London 1669) 273. The citation is not from his commentary reproduced in the *Critica Sacra* but probably from a lexicographical work not available to me.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Because not only are piles caused, largely, by chronic constipation which (pregnancy apart) is due to unconscious causes, but the pain is due to the tightening of the sphincter, itself a normal unconscious muscular reflex. On hemorrhoids, their sad progress and treatment see *Encycl. Brit.*

A curious coincidence would sustain such a conjecture. Retrospective investigation of her case would find, fantastically, a mention of piles in the very text to which Jesus himself sends us. As we must strip off the Marcan addition of v. 34 ὑπαγε . . . σου, we are left, correctly, with ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε as the climax of the story^(15a). We are sent exclusively to Hab 2,4. The verse begins *hinēh* 'PLH which can certainly be read 'ofēlā rather than the MT 'upēlā. We shall return to the verse and obtain a more convincing midrash from it. Moreover those words of Mark which are deliberately chosen to imply menorrhagia, namely πηγή αἵματος, which picks up Lev 12,7; 20,18, and, with Lev 15,25-27.33, prejudice us in favour of a vaginal discharge as the true nature of her problem, do not, on closer inspection, necessarily and conclusively point in that direction. *Bôr dam*, rather than *māqôr dam*, is a late Hebrew expression for an extreme symptom of dysentery⁽¹⁶⁾. However we can be sure that no one could survive the extreme stage of dysentery for twelve years; and what is *much more important*, any continuous or unpredictable abdominal bleeding *apart from the vagina* would certainly in practice exclude a woman from the *miqweh*, so that she could never be ready for a husband⁽¹⁷⁾. As we shall see, the ritual bath is *not* foreign to our story as Mark presents it. On the whole, however, common sense and general medical knowledge point to menorrhagia as the illness, and this can have various causes; or indeed there may have been vaginal bleeding from fibroids (thus

(¹¹1910), art. 'Haemorrhoids'; J. H. HARDING RAINS and H. D. RITCHIE, edd., *Bailey and Love's Short Practice of Surgery* (London ¹⁷1977) 1060-1065; P. B. BEESON *et al.*, edd., *Cecil: Textbook of Medicine* (Philadelphia ¹⁵1979) 1617. These works do not relate that *cauterisation*, much used in the ancient world, is still practised by some surgeons to this day!

(^{15a}) J. ROLOFF, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus* (Göttingen ²1973) 153.

(¹⁶) *b. Ned.* 41b (Soncino trans. 132) (R. Johanan). I follow the interpretation of *bûrdam/bûrdas* given by the lexicographers JASTROW and LEVY rather than that of J. PREUSS, *Biblisch-talmudische Medizin* (Berlin 1911/1969) 213-214 (piles).

(¹⁷) On the practice of the *miqweh* see *m. Miqwaôt* ix. Pedantic distinctions between bloods (e.g. *y. Niddah* 4, Str-B II, 10) will not help in practice, for any show of blood in the *miqweh* would cause disruption (to put it mildly).

preserving *opelâ*). Dysentery is too serious, and piles (however painful) too minor a complaint to fit all the circumstances⁽¹⁸⁾.

Was the Woman suffering from her complaint *due to sin*? If so Deut 32,39; Ps 103,3, and John 1,4 apply. Luke (8,47) thinks the woman made a public confession (not merely, surely, of her ritual indiscretion Lev 15,19; Num 5, 2-3, her belief in magic, or her want of boldness) (ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ encouraged by Mark's πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν). However that may be, her *faith* saved her. There is a dispute whether this faith is in Jesus^(18a) or in God. However Mark 5,23 (σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ) has prepared us to understand that she was given 'life'. Like Hannah (1 Sam 1,17) she goes in peace, to live as a fertile woman should. In spite of Luke 10,41, 'life' for a woman meant providing life to and for others (alternative careers were not contemplated). To pagans' minds, too, women healed by gods must become fertile^(18b).

We shall be observing the Woman's midrashic coincidence with the Girl: i.e. texts which appear to be illustrated by the story of the one also apply to the other. But this is the point at which to study the enigmatic Hab 2,4, which we know is not only the foundation-stone of reformed theology but was also used in ancient times to throw light on the messianic hope. Jesus' apparently culpable delay in capriciously enquiring into that Woman *ex post facto* fits with Hab 2,3 (LXX εἰν ὕστερήσῃ ὑπόμεινον αὐτὸν, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἤξει, καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ [see Heb 10,37-39]), which we know was cited in connection with the Messiah's coming⁽¹⁹⁾. Now this passage was not read in the time of Jesus in quite the form chosen, understand-

⁽¹⁸⁾ G. ADER, *Enarrationes de aegrotis et morbis in evangelio* 12, at *Annotationes in Quatuor Evangelia = Criticorum Sacrorum*, VI (Amsterdam 1698), col. 548-550 (final pagination).

^(18a) The ambiguity is deliberate, for Jesus represented God. R. H. FULLER, *Interpreting the Miracles* (London 1963) 42. D. L. TIEDE, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker* (Missoula 1973) 268, suggests Jesus' δύναμις was not available if the sufferer did not have faith in Jesus as miracleworker. KERTELGE, *Wunder*, 120. This is incorrect. See Mark 6,1-6(!), which KOCH rightly notices, *Bedeutung*, 138-139.

^(18b) O. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder* (Giessen 1909) 28 (note case of Io at 19, 24, 26).

⁽¹⁹⁾ 1QpHab VII; b. Sanh. 97b; *Yalqût ad loc.* C. H. DODD, *According to the Scriptures* (London 1952) 49-51. 1QpHab VIII, connection with Judgment.

ably, much later, by the Masoretes. *Nefes*, which means 'person', 'body', and even 'corpse', as well as 'spirit', is feminine, and we must bear this in mind when we consider their decision to read in 2,4a a word 'PLH as *up^elâ*, meaning 'swollen' in the sense of 'arrogant', which is the sense followed by the targumim. As often occurred, another reading was current, namely 'LPH, one vocalization of which would be either *'ulepeh* or *'ulāpā*, meaning 'fainting', 'retiring', 'sinking'. This was the reading which both the LXX and their zealous reviser Aquila used. The former have ὑποστείλῃται, the latter νωχελουομένου. To avoid prolixity I give a very literal translation of the verse with the reading evidenced from both before and after the time of Christ ('LPH): "Behold she drags behind. She is not upright (not standing straight, not honest). His spirit is within him: and the righteous shall live in his faith (or by faith in him)". The LXX, attending to the *sense*, have "the just shall live through faith in *me*". Alternatively we can take 2,4ab in two other ways: (1) "Behold his spirit within him is lagging behind, not *direct*; but...", and (2) "Behold she faints away...". It must be remembered that where different interpretations may legitimately be obtained from a text all are true concurrently⁽²⁰⁾. Where the Western mind would make a choice and exclude the remainder, Jewish scholars treasured (as they still do) all possibilities. In the same verse a reading of *nafšî* for the *nafšô* of the MT can be posited from the LXX and Aquila's version; but it is equally possible that the translators read *nafšô* as if it were *nafšî*, by a known technique. At that rate God says he is dissatisfied with the condition of the 'swollen', 'dragging', and 'fainting' female(s)! The implication is that something has to be done about them; and salvation comes by faith (in God). In a society in which vicarious faith is known it does *not* have to be the faith of the sufferer herself.

B. *The Girl*

Fertility would seem to be the clue to the Girl also. Information about her condition is not so limited as with the Woman: the stories in any case came from different sources⁽²¹⁾. Her father wanted hands laid upon her, as if her condition was spirit-posses-

⁽²⁰⁾ b. B. Bat 75a.

⁽²¹⁾ See ROCHAIS, *Récits*, on this.

sion⁽²²⁾. She ἐσχάτως ἔχει (23), and she had the whole 'family' in excitement (v. 35). Quite by coincidence (!) she is taken for dead while her respectable father is at the unorthodox healer's *feet*. Yet she responds to the word of command (v. 42) with extraordinary promptitude. The much discussed οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει has enormous value in the history of faith: but its ambiguity cannot be detached from a guess⁽²³⁾ as to the Girl's condition. She is capable of walking immediately and she is *twelve*. A modern diagnostician⁽²⁴⁾ would pursue a routine with her, and it is imperative that his process of thought should be reproduced here.

Physicians the world over have been successful when equipped with special skills, including intuition. They are also extremely cautious. The claim made on behalf of Jesus that he cured persons of whom doctors had despaired⁽²⁵⁾ is not merely an artistic exaggeration: it places Jesus both amongst physicians and beyond them. The physicians attending the Woman and those attending Jairus' daughter were at a loss. This at once suggests a functional disorder now known as *conversion symptoms*. I shall dismiss the Woman for the present, as the links are unknown. In the case of the Girl *dum silet clamat*. The menarche, the age of which is not an unknown entity⁽²⁶⁾, can well give rise to fears of growing

(22) D. FLUSSER, "Healing through the laying-on of hands in a Dead Sea Scroll", *IEJ* 7 (1957), 107-108 (1QapGen XX, ll. 21-22, 29). ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 58. J. BEHM, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (Leipzig 1911) 148-53 says Jesus shared the superstition.

(23) Commentators (not G. W. WADE, *New Testament History* [London 1922] 40) often say Jesus cannot have known that she slept (cf. John 11,11) until he saw the Girl, and that his ejection of the mourners can only be justified by supernatural knowledge — which, of course many have doubted. At Mark 5,39 we *too* are invited by the evangelist to guess what her condition was (the world thinks her dead, v. 35, and cf. ἀνακείμενον, v. 40 v. 1.). VAN DER LOOS, *Miracles*, 569 (deep unconsciousness).

(24) I am obliged to Miss E. Heaton (Radcliffe Science Library, Oxford) for certain references on 'conversion symptoms'.

(25) WEINREICH, *Heilungswunder*, 195. Tob 2,10 esp. Sin. 1QapGen XX, line 20. *Test. Iobi* 38,7f.

(26) References at B. DATTA and D. GUPTA, "The age at menarche in classical India", *Annals of Human Biology* 8, pt. 4 (1981) 351-359 (classical Western sources show 13-14, but Jewish evidence approaches South Asian data).

up⁽²⁷⁾. It has been found that hysteria and conversion symptoms coincide with sexual indifference⁽²⁸⁾. It is notorious that a famous hysterical condition, *anorexia nervosa* (by which a girl may, and sometimes does, starve herself to death), is associated with unconscious problems regarding mating. The opposite problem, adolescent obesity (curiously commoner in some territories than others) is an alternative escape-mechanism. The unconscious, which commands in these areas, is "hardly more than a 'trick' of the individual to escape his responsibilities and life tasks"⁽²⁹⁾.

It is necessary for us to go into detail. The physician first excludes the vast number of lesions and conditions which can cause stupor and coma⁽³⁰⁾. When, at last, he is convinced that the symptoms are inexplicable on the basis of a known physical illness, he reluctantly diagnoses hysterical neurosis. This is the 'conversion' by the patient of a psychic conflict which he himself does not recognise, into a disorder of sensation or motor function, or to a gross disruption of the normal sense of awareness⁽³¹⁾. Sentient consciousness may be present in cases of total psychogenic unresponsiveness. Of course it can supervene on organic disorder, and total psychogenic unresponsiveness very rarely lasts more than a short time⁽³²⁾: but instances of prolonged catatonic or cataleptic conditions are far from unknown. The catatonic stupor as a conversion symptom is no ordinary condition, and physicians certainly remember any instance within their experience⁽³³⁾.

⁽²⁷⁾ J. A. SHERMAN, *On the Psychology of Women* (Springfield, Ill. 1971) 117-121.

⁽²⁸⁾ J. FARLEY *et al.*, "The prevalence of hysteria and conversion symptoms", *British Journal of Psychiatry* 114 (1968) 1121-1125 (an excellent survey).

⁽²⁹⁾ A. ADLER, quoted by S. CROWN in S. KRAUSS, *Encyclopedic Handbook of Medical Psychology* (London 1976) 325.

⁽³⁰⁾ F. PLUM and J. B. POSNER, *Diagnosis of Stupor and Coma* (Oxford 1966) 218.

⁽³¹⁾ KRAUSS, *Handbook*, 325. R. W. WOODRUFF *et al.*, "Hysteria", *British Journal of Psychiatry* 115 (1969) 1243-1248.

⁽³²⁾ PLUM and POSNER, *Diagnosis*, 218-219.

⁽³³⁾ My neighbour Dr Frank Haine related a case at which he was present. The adolescent girl was totally unresponsive. Her family and medical attendants despaired. A surgeon was called to attempt a lumbar puncture, but sensed what was amiss. He passed a huge needle right through her

Of course in the ancient world these inexplicable conditions would be referred to evil spirits. It is easy to recognise our Girl in the symptoms provided in a textbook: catatonic schizophrenia in a young person acute after an emotional upset or outburst; total unresponsiveness to the environment; lying with the eyes fixed open, or shut; very high respiration and rapid pulse; drooling; urinary problems (a sure sign, for the ancients, of the presence of a demon!); grimacing and jerking; staying fixed in whatever position he is placed in; retaining, however, a cognitive function (unlike many stupors and comas); and awakening immediately when the clue to the disorder has been discovered⁽³⁴⁾. Conversion neurosis will provide motor paralysis, and total anaesthesia. It is very much more common in girls and young women than amongst males⁽³⁵⁾. Hence 'hysteria'. Premenstrual changes are known to be associated with this condition⁽³⁶⁾. The skilled physician immediately suspects malingering: and it is said no hysterical paralysis occurs except in anticipation of gain⁽³⁷⁾. I agree: it is part of an unconscious technique of blackmail, and 'spirit-possession' is only a parallel device. A Jewish legend which, in its present form, is probably a counterblast to Christian propaganda, tells how a pupil of the saintly 'Rabbi' (b. A. D. 135), successfully 'raised' a servant of Antoninus (Septimius Severus? [193-211]) from 'death'^(37a). The tale, however, is nicely balanced between malingering and conversion symptoms; it is

thigh. She made no sign. He told her (in the local idiom), 'You have had it now. You can get up and go home'. She got up immediately. Her elder sister had recently become engaged, and had absorbed the family's attention.

⁽³⁴⁾ PLUM and POSNER, *Diagnosis*, 219-221. Adolescents who are severely disturbed may undergo self-injury: S. L. COPEL, ed., *Behaviour Pathology of Childhood and Adolescence* (New York 1973) 204-205. This, by the way, is a more fruitful way of understanding Mk 9,20-22, which is usually diagnosed as epilepsy. Spirit-possession and conversion symptoms can certainly be cured charismatically, but whether epilepsy can remains unproven.

⁽³⁵⁾ A. M. NICHOLI, *The Harvard Guide to Modern Psychiatry* (Cambridge, Mass.-London 1978) 182-185 (an excellent survey).

⁽³⁶⁾ NICHOLI, *Harvard Guide*, 184. T. P. DETRE and H. G. JARECKI, *Modern Psychiatric Treatment* (Philadelphia Toronto 1971) 223-225.

⁽³⁷⁾ P. HILL et al., ed., *Essentials of Postgraduate Psychiatry* (London and New York 1979) 22 (conversion reaction).

^(37a) *Lev. Rab.* X. 4 (Soncino trans., 125). PREUSS, *Medizin*, 353.

no attempt to ridicule Christian pretensions, since if that had been the object Rabbi's own pretensions would have been exploded.

Detail on sham unconsciousness, mimicking death, and perhaps leading, if not treated, to actual death, is relevant; but not less requisite is a close understanding of why the girl's age is relevant, and why Jesus used that particular form of address. A third-century categorisation of girls⁽³⁸⁾ must relate matters stable over centuries. We must assume puberty at 12½. Our Girl, according to that source, is a *na'arâ* (a girl whose marriage must be arranged), or, from 12½ to her marriage, a *bogeret*. There are therefore varieties of 'virgins' or 'maids'. The word for 'virgin', *btûlâ* (see Jer 31,12 MT) is a cross-classification. The conventional form of address to such girls requires a choice between two available Aramaic words, *'ûlêmîṭâ* (or *'ûlêmîṭâ'*) or *ṭalyṭâ*. The former, appertaining to 'LM, 'to be strong', suggests a well-grown girl. The latter better fits an unmarried girl, marriageable or not. Now *ṭalyṭâ* (which can suggest a lamb)⁽³⁹⁾ translated κοράσιον fits either a *na'arâ* or even a girl junior to her, a *qetanâ*. *Ṭalyṭâ* ignores the girl's nubility. It equals the Heb. *yalda* (female child), which, as we know from *Tgs. Gen* 35,3-4, can equal *na'arâ* (Prov 9,3; 31,15 Targ.). *Na'arâ* is rendered κοράσιον in the LXX some 13 times: the Greek word implies a 'damsel', but includes a non-virgin^(39a), while *na'arâ* can be presumed to be a virgin. Jesus' use of *ṭalyṭâ* = κοράσιον = *na'arâ*, a girl not yet 12½, ignores the marital status of our young patient. The most highly significant 'business' at Ezek 16,4-14 (see

⁽³⁸⁾ Sources at Str-B II, 10, s.v. 5,23.

⁽³⁹⁾ The common opinion is that *ṭalyṭâ* is present as part of a magical formula. E. and M. L. KELLER, *Miracles in Dispute* (London 1969) 122; TIEDE, *Charismatic Figure*, 266-267, citing H. D. BETZ, *Lukian* (Berlin 1961) 154. ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 68, thought Mark kept the foreign words because he saw no point in ejecting them, whereas Matthew and Luke had no reason to insert them. E. LÓPEZ-DÓRIGA, "Y cogiendo la mano de la niña le dice: Talitha Koumi (Mk 5,41)", *Est Eccl* 39 (1964) 377-381: the Aramaic is retained because of the nuance: 'Little lamb, get up' (Jesus' fondness for the young). We say, however, that the Aramaic is retained because that form of address ignores her betrothal arrangements, and recalls the Song of Songs.

^(39a) There is such a person as an 'honorary virgin' (a comic but ubiquitous usage, e.g. *Eng.* 'maid'). SHAKESPEARE, *Comedy of Errors* IV. iv, 74-75.

below) took place during the female's 'girlhood' (Ezek 16,22 *n'ûrâ*) — she was a *na'arâ*.

Our Girl will have been kept absolutely isolated (incomunicado) from non-related males; the prospect of her betrothal, or even of the expected bridegroom, was too much for her. That is my conjecture. A catatonic stupor, a variety of conversion symptom, eventuated as her form of protest; and it was highly successful. Until, that is to say, the sharp word of command broke the syndrome. But there is room for speculation, as we shall see.

In biblical language the Daughter of Sion is the victim of incompetent attempts to heal her employed by the so-called wise of her day (e. g. Jairus): her recovery requires the Lord himself as a healer (Jer 8,11.18-22). He appears on the scene as an alternative bridegroom. Indeed he does. Jesus appears with three adult witnesses^(39b), not merely to certify the miracle, but to be his *šôšvîn*, his 'groomsmen'⁽⁴⁰⁾, who, if it had been a real wedding, would guarantee the terms of the contract. The father and mother are there (v. 40), not merely for propriety's sake, but to give the girl, as it were. Now we know why the story starts 'by the sea' (v. 21), for the sea is a great *miqweh*, abode of ritual purity⁽⁴¹⁾. There is a feast to come. No doubt on the surface *δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν* (the climax of the story at v. 43⁽⁴²⁾) relates what any sensible physician would order in the circumstances (she would eat like a horse), and, at one

^(39b) Deut 19,15; Matt 18,16; 2 Cor 13,1 (a proposition continually cropping up in the New Testament). See nn. 52 and 56 below.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ DERRETT, *Law in the New Testament* (London 1970) 229, 232, 346 n. 2.

⁽⁴¹⁾ *m. Miq.* V. 4. When the Children of Israel passed through the Red Sea it purified them from Egypt, and prepared them for their spousals with YHWH at Sinai. The Greeks shared this notion of the sea: GRUPPE, *Gr. Myth. Rel.* 889 n. 1. On the λούτρον νυμφικόν of the ἱερὸς γάμος see H. GRAILLOT at C. DAREMBERG and E. SAGLIO, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, fasc. 24 (Paris 1898) 180. *Atharvaveda* XIV. 1.37-39. See also IQS V. 14 and Cant 8,7.

⁽⁴²⁾ G. QUESNELL, *The Mind of Mark* (Rome 1969) 161ff., 202, found it 'totally inexplicable'. Commentators often wondered why the command to feed (see Cod. Bezae: J. M. EFIRD at *Fest. Stinespring* [Duke, N. C. 1972] 306-308) comes last in Mark, while Luke's order (Luke 8,55-56) is more logical. See G. THEISSEN, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten* (Gütersloh 1974) 151-152. Actually Jesus operates LXX Ps 32,19 (διαθρέψαι).

blow, puts an end to fears that she might have been reanimated by an evil spirit or ghost⁽⁴³⁾, but the symbolism is of a wedding feast.

Note how Jesus casts out the ritual mourners with amazing boldness. To forbid mourning for the dead implies either enormous malice on the part of the one who forbids or great wickedness in the deceased (Ezek 24,17,23), for it was forbidden to mourn criminals and those slain by the hand of heaven⁽⁴⁴⁾. But on the Day of Days mourning (θόρυβος, Heb. *hāmon*) and pangs (ὠδίνες) are forbidden (Ezek 7,4,10-12 LXX, taking the prophecy positively); it was not the time to weep (Qoh 3,4); their mourning was to be turned into joy (Isa 61,2-3; cf. Ps 30,11; Isa 51,11) so that the virgin rejoices (Jer 31,13 MT).

Mark tells us (v. 40) Jesus went into the place where she was. The correct text seems to be that printed again after a century in Huck-Greeven's *Synopsis* (1981): εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον ἀνακείμενον. The word ἀνακείμενον is extraordinarily appropriate. It seems that when the clue to it was lost it appeared superfluous, or inappropriate; and we have two stages of an 'improvement', viz. κατακείμενον and κατακεκλιμένον as well as the mere elimination of the word in the important uncials⁽⁴⁵⁾. There is a triple meaning. He found the girl had been 'laid aside' (as a corpse)⁽⁴⁶⁾, for they were concentrating on their mourning in which, no doubt, guilt mingled with grief. She was, meanwhile, a kind of offering to himself⁽⁴⁷⁾, and that too in two senses. Ἀνατίθημι (cf. ἀνάθημα) can be used of an offering of almost any kind; and of course especially of that peculiar form of offering, the votive offering in thankfulness for the (miraculous) healing of a suppliant⁽⁴⁸⁾. The

⁽⁴³⁾ Tob 12,19; Luke 24,39,43; Acts 10,41.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ References at DERRETT, *Studies in the New Testament*, I (Leiden 1977) 198.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The evidence, often omitted, is provided at A. HUCK, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, ed. H. GREEVEN (Tübingen 1981) 104 *ad loc.*

⁽⁴⁶⁾ 'Put down', see LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, *Greek-English Lexicon*, new edition, s.v. II. 3; s.v. ἀνάκειμαι I. 2. 'Set up to die': Polyb. 1.86.6. 'Buried': Or. Gr. Ins. 602 (at Jaffa!).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ She was *de facto* at his disposal.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ On the age-old practice of offering *simulacra* of diseased limbs, etc., see 1 Sam 6,5-11. Vows had to be paid in votive offerings: see the inscrip-

whole girl was to be an ἀνάθημα! Furthermore, unknown to them all, and to her, but not to him, she was a prospective 'diner' ⁽⁴⁹⁾ at the 'marriage' banquet which was, for her, the messianic banquet, which is the climax of the whole story (v. 43b). Precisely because she was stretched out (and ready washed?) as a corpse she was laid on the couch which was to be the scene of her betrothal to the Bridegroom! The fancifulness of this is not mine but Mark's. A silly girl plays (unconsciously) a wretched trick on her poor parents; but she is thought to be an apt subject to illustrate the coming of the Bridegroom to the Daughter of Jerusalem.

When Jesus speaks to her she is indeed Jairus' θυγάτηρ (cf. Cant 2,2 LXX), but unlike the Woman, whom he actually addresses as 'daughter' (ignoring her age), this girl, an analogical daughter (cf. Jer 3,4), is not so addressed: she is merely *ἡλυτᾶ*. It is likely that her actual betrothal will have been rendered void by her behaviour if not by its sequel; whether she did marry after these goings-on is anyone's guess. If she was 12 in A. D. 30 she may well have been alive in Mark's time (as Bornhäuser noted), but I very much doubt whether he bothered to trace her or obtain her version of the events.

Meanwhile Jesus takes her by the hand. He will have taken her by his right hand ^(49a), and subsequent sculpture is probably right in showing him grasping her *left* hand, which is only tactful. Had he been shown taking her right hand in his that would have been *dextrarum iunctio*, which is a symbol of marriage, and therefore much shown in sculpture ⁽⁵⁰⁾. However, to take, and grasp by the (right) hand is a universal symbol of marriage, and is easily recognisa-

tion at Takht-i Sangīn (c. 150 B. C.): εὐχὴν ἀνέθηκεν Ἀτροσώκης (a fire-priest) Ὡξῶι (to the Oxus river) (B. A. LITVINSKIY and I. R. PICHKIYAN at *J. Royal Asiatic Soc.* 1981, no. 2, 153). See 154 for a silver hand larger than life-size. Vast numbers of human figures once complete were found, many of them portraits.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ ἀνακείμενος means 'diner' in the New Testament (so Luke 22,27): cf. Matt 22,10.11! At a death-feast one *sat*, one did not *recline*.

^(49a) It is the right hand which biblical imagery requires, and pagan symbolism confirms: WEINREICH, *Heilungswunder*, 33, 39. K. SUDHOFF, "Handauflegung des Heilgottes auf attischen Weihetafeln", *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 18 (1926) 235-250.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. 31, 1652-1656.

ble⁽⁵¹⁾. According to Mark Jesus often took the sick (Mk 9,27), even females, by the hand (Mk 1,31); he was not afraid of implications. To take the hand of the suppliant is the way YHWH himself gives protection (LXX Ps 72,33; Isa 41,13; 42,6).

The command (not doubled, as is curiously supposed somewhere)⁽⁵²⁾ to *rise* happens to be the command of the divine bridegroom⁽⁵³⁾ at Cant 2,10.13 (passages taken messianically): *qûmî lāk... ûlêkî-lāk* (arise... walk) (LXX ἀνάστα ἐλθέ; cf. v. 42: ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιπατεῖ). No doubt the feminine should be, even here, *qûmî* (see Isa 61,1!), but evidence of an Aram. *qûm* for the feminine too can be found repeatedly at *b. Shab.* 110a-b. However it is easy to see why *qûmî* rather than *qûm* should have appealed to respectable textual sources⁽⁵⁴⁾. Twice the Spirit addressed the Beloved, 'Rise'; the third and conclusive occasion occurred in our episode. No wonder the bystanders are enjoined to keep this a secret. Cant 2 tells how the Children of Israel are to be redeemed by their good works (see Targum); and this banal scene is a very unsuitable illustration. 'Arise' however is the word of YHWH through the Messiah, as formerly through Elijah⁽⁵⁵⁾. But if it was known that the Messiah had come to rescue girls from unattractive betrothals, a plague of catatonic stupors would afflict the entire neighbourhood. One does not need to go into elaborate theories about 'messianic secret' in order to explain Jesus' injunction at v. 43, or its somewhat unexpected position in that sentence^(55a).

⁽⁵¹⁾ *Ibid.* The young bridegroom grabs the bride by the right hand and introduces her to his family. Taking the hand was an essential of the most ancient Aryan marriage: Rgveda X.85,36.

⁽⁵²⁾ Aphrahat the Persian Sage. T. BAARDA, *NTS* 27 (1981) 632-640, at 633.

⁽⁵³⁾ *Pesiqta Rabbati* 15.8,9,10,12; 36.2 (trans. W. G. BRAUDE, [New Haven — London 1968], I, 317ff., II, 680-1). The citation of this late work is justified since it contains traditional *sermon* material.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 66-68. Here HUCK-GREEVEN and the UBS GNT³ omit the evidence, but K. ALAND gives it (*Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* [Stuttgart 1964] 132).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ *Pesiqta Rabbati* 15.14/15 (trans. BRAUDE I, 325).

^(55a) As G. MINETTE DE TILLESSE, *Le secret messianique dans l'évangile de Marc* (Paris 1968) 248-251. Not even in the sophisticated version offered by K. TAGAWA, *Miracles et Évangile* (Paris 1966) 163, 167. There is a rational explanation for Jesus' injunction to silence, even though the injunction itself is hardly realistic (KERTELGE, *Wunder*, 119).

If her 'walking' enacts response to Cant 2,10.13 her eating implies her return to normal living (Qoh 5,19), benefiting from her compliance (Isa 1,19; 65,13 [cf. Luke 15,17]) instead of dying of inanition (Ps 102,4), and she leaves her 'transgression' behind her (Ps 107,17-18). The Bride being *awakened*, the next item on the agenda is a feast: so Cant 4,16; 5,1. Φαγεῖν is naturally the last word. The parents and their servants will overwhelm the party with hospitality. No doubt she is no ghost (see above), but there is more. 'To eat' is a well-known sexual symbol (and her parents will exhort her to comply with their wishes). At the End of Days, however, unmarried women will take hold of the Branch (another symbol), offering to eat their own bread, provided their 'reproach' is taken away (Isa 4,1; cf. 2; and cf. Zech 24,7-11), but not while any crowd is milling about (cf. Mark 3,20; 6,31), while the Saviour's 'work' besets him (cf. John 4,31-34). He must chose with whom he eats in the light of Luke 13,26. In case any should doubt whether we are on the right track, support follows from the appropriate quarters.

The ἸΕΡΟΣ ΓΑΜΟΣ

Just as James and John are silently provided as a Christian substitute for the Dioscuri⁽⁵⁶⁾, so our ἱερὸς γάμος reassures pagans that within Christianity they find a purified version of an ubiquitous source of mystery and religion⁽⁵⁷⁾. At the same time the marriage

⁽⁵⁶⁾ DERRETT, *NT* 22 (1980) 299-303. A secondary stage in the gospel tradition according to W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen 1965) 61 n. 2. It will be remembered that James and John were with Peter at an earlier handhealing, female-resurrection story (ἤγειρεν αὐτήν) (Mark 1,29-31). A. FARRER, *A Study in St. Mark* (Westminster 1951) 84, sees Jairus as the old synagogue, Peter the new, and Jesus recruiting from the new and later from the old. G. SCHMAHL, *Die Zwölf im Markus-evangelium* (Trier 1974) 128-131 (messianic secret).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ A. KLINZ, "Ἱερὸς Γάμος" (Diss. Halle 1933); id. "Ἱερ. Γα.", *Paulys RealEncyclopädie*, ed. WISSOWA-KROLL, Supplementband VI (Stuttgart 1935), col. 107-13. A. B. COOK, *Zeus*, III, pt. 2, app. R, 1025-65. GRAILLOT in DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, fasc. 24 (1898) 177-181. E. O. JAMES, *The Cult of the Mother Goddess* (London 1959), see index, 'Marriage, the Sacred'. R. A. BATEY, *NTS* 10 (1963/4) 121-127. C. J. BLEEKER, "Isis as a saviour goddess", *The Saviour God*, ed. S. G. F. BRANDON (Manchester 1963) ch. 1. R. MER-

of YHWH with his people is one of the most sacred ideas of Judaism⁽⁵⁸⁾. That marriage remains (Isa 50,1; Jer 3,1), despite constant upheavals, because of *faith*; and precisely as in our pericope and in Hab 2,4 there is ambiguity whether it is YHWH's faith towards Israel, or Israel's unconscious faith in him. The possibly dominical v. 34a makes faith the climax of the first story, and Jairus' behaviour at vv. 22-23 makes his faith plain. The little drama at vv. 35-36 was written to emphasise that the Girl's rising depended on faith. Sycophantically the bearers of ill news (given, as usual, with relish) pretend that they are concerned for the 'rabbi' (see below), who is not to be 'exploited' further. The Girl is dead, laid by: *their* problems are over. Jesus overhears (παρακούσας) what they say⁽⁵⁹⁾. As the word really implies, he also *ignores* them⁽⁶⁰⁾, not caring to address them as he addresses the people at vv. 39-40 while brusquely turning the professional mourners out. No doubt the mourners enhance the miracle⁽⁶¹⁾. But the

KELBACH, *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (Berlin 1962) 16f., 71 n. 3, 77 n. 1, 143f., 257 n. 2, 331.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Exod 19,10 (*wəqidaš'itām*) and Num 7,1 by interpretation. Ps 45; Cant 5-6; Isa 54,5f.; 62,1-5; 64,41; Jer 2,2,32; Ezek 16,8-19; Hos 2,16-20; 9,10; 11,1-3. *Pesiqta Rabbati* 5.10. *Sifre Deut.* XXXIV. 3. C. WIENER and J. COLSON, *Un roi fit des noces à son fils* (Bruges 1962). The authors of this excellent work ignore Mark 5. P. PROULX-L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Bib* 59 (1978) 1-37.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Most modern translations render the correct παρακούσας (which is read in HUCK-GREEVEN and UBS GNT³) instead of ἀκούσας (TR). ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 61.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Ignore, with the implication of declining to defer: Symm. at (LXX) Ps 38,12; Esth 4,14 (LXX); Matt 18,17. The accusative of words ignored or disregarded: LUCIAN, *Jud. Voc.* 2 (LCL I, 396); Esth 3,3.8 (LXX).

⁽⁶¹⁾ Scholars have pointed to this feature to establish the legendary (novelistic) character of the pericope. But no pagan example contains the mourners' opposition in quite this way. There is, however, a perfect parallel in a documented example from not long ago. An old woman of Normandy Is. was put in a chair for the funeral ceremonies. The Rev. Dr. Brownlow pointed out that she was still alive. The mourners, well advanced in their ritual, ridiculed the suggestion, since 'her head and throat' were dead. Defying the missionary, they proceeded with the burial. When with great reluctance they at last agreed to lift the woman out, she revived and (much to their disgust) succumbed the following morning. The interruption of the ritual was of much more consequence to them than the woman's sufferings. See G. BROWN, *Melanesians and Polynesians* (London 1910) 391-392.

point lies elsewhere. YHWH is repeatedly begged not to ignore the needs of the faithful⁽⁶²⁾. Ironically, by ignoring those who would have stopped him, he attends to those needs. Jesus addresses himself to Jairus (of whom more later): *μόνον πίστευε, faith is enough*. And so every hearer has understood it⁽⁶³⁾. Admittedly, as has been shown^(63a), the faith that has caused a sufferer to take action, or which is proved by his action, is very different from the faith of one who hopes to believe (Mark 9,24) in order that a miracle may be performed for him. The story of Jairus' daughter is not merely an exemplary tale encouraging others to have a particular faith: it makes (at least in Mark's hands) a substantive statement about 'death'. Whether one's suddenly-lost beloved is 'dead', or 'sleeping', is a matter of one's faith in God, demanded by Christ. If one has this faith, she is only sleeping. And shall she awake at the End of Days, to become his Bride?

Hosea

Hab 2,4 and Cant 2 (above) are not enough. We must now turn to Hos 2,19-20 MT (LXX 21-22), where the basis of the Sacred Marriage is set out. "And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee to me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will betroth thee to me in faith (steadfastness), and thou shalt *know* the Lord". The 'in' implies 'by means of', by way of the marriage contract. With RŠ it means 'at the price of' (so 2 Sam 3,14); the Bridegroom's faithfulness is pledged. At Hab 2,4 we have 'faith in him', or 'his faith', not as alternatives but as co-valid meanings. As a reward for their faith the Messiah will assemble *all* the folk (Cant 4,8 LXX;

⁽⁶²⁾ Pss 28,1; 35,27; 50,3; 83,2; 109,1.

⁽⁶³⁾ ROLOFF, *Kerygma*, 153f. See Mark 6,1-6. Some connection exists between the Jairus story and the source of Matt 8,5-13 Luke 7,1-10, where faith is especially praised (KERTELGE, *Wunder*, 113). For the tale itself see n. 37a and my comments on it (above). ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 62, has the credit of linking 'Fear not!' with Gen 21,17. ROLOFF is right (p. 155): there is no epiphany/theophany here. On the sleep of death: O. MICHEL, "Zur Lehre vom Todesschlaf", *ZNW* 35 (1936) 285-90. L. SABOURIN, *The Divine Miracles Discussed and Defended* (Rome 1977) 123.

^(63a) THEISSEN, *Wundergeschichten*, 136-138.

Hos 2,21-22)⁽⁶⁴⁾. As the Mekilta says⁽⁶⁵⁾, the Holy Spirit rests on those that have faith (Exod 14,31; 15,1; Ps 106,12).

Zephaniah

Mark emphasises tremendously Jesus' being *squeezed* in a crowd (a threefold statement: Mk 5,21.24.31). He moves between the sea and the crowd: as we shall see we have the idea of the people needing to be redeemed. Immediately there is introduced a synagogue-manager or -trustee with the most intriguing name Jairus. This could come from either of two Heb. roots, but most probably means 'He who gives light', or 'The Enlightener'⁽⁶⁶⁾. Of course synagogue-managers were not rabbis; yet they were responsible for religion in a practical sense and were leaders of their community. Jairus was what is called sarcastically at Jn 3,10 a 'teacher of Israel', though he almost certainly taught, if at all, by deputy and by example. The reference to Jesus as 'the teacher'^(66a) by Jairus' servants at Mk 5,35 is marvellously ironical: they thought Jesus was a religious notability in much the same sense as other 'illuminated ones' who would lecture to all and sundry if a public space was open to them — persons Jairus would gladly patronise if not grossly unorthodox. Jairus was not sufficiently 'enlightened' himself to save his own daughter, indeed to provide her with an enlightened social environment. No doubt: the synagogue was anti-charismatic (Mk 3,5).

Now let us look into Zeph 3,17-19. Keeping the LXX and Vulgate in view, we may render from the MT:

17. YHWH thy God is in thy *midst* (so Dt 18,15!). A *migh-*ty one saves. He shall rejoice over thee in the rejoicing/feast. He works/ignores (cf. παρακούσας) / remains silent in his love (his work of love ignores distractions). He shall rejoice over thee in the cry (of beseeching or jubilation [cf.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ *Mek.* Bešallah VII.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ *Ibid.* VII. 155 (trans. LAUTERBACH, I, 254).

⁽⁶⁶⁾ *Encyclopedia Judaica* IX (1971) 1269. PESCH supports the derivation *yā'îr* (he will awake) which, naturally, I find less attractive, though it is not to be dismissed, as onomatology can use multiple derivations. For the significance of proper names see A. STRUS, *Nomen-Omen* (AnBib 80; Rome 1978). The idea that 'Jairus' filtered into Mark from Luke 8,41 (ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 56) is wrong (R. PESCH, "Jairus", *BZ* 14 [1970] 252-256).

^(66a) R. RIESNER, *Jesus als Lehrer* (Tübingen 1981) 273f.

Jerome *ad* 15]). 18. "I have taken up out of the assembly/crowd those who were afflicted (or were afflicted out of the assembly). From thee they [which? who?] have been (in the past) — a burden upon her — a shame (a shameful burden has been taken from her). 19. Behold I work upon all those that afflict/humble thee at the Season, and I shall save her that limps [or 'sins'? cf. Jastrow, *Dict.* s. v. *šāla'*] and I gather up her who is driven out, and have set them for a praise and for a Name in all the land of their shame". On this theme cf. Mark 14,9 (the anointress).

We notice the reference to 'assembly', which suggests synagogue. In this pericope Mark shows Jesus assembling, dismissing, and reassembling participants in the story of the Girl, and witnesses of the power of God. The relevance of Zephaniah to the Woman is clear from 3,13 — *she tells no lies*. Jesus' quaint form of address, θυγάτηρ, occurs twice at 3,14. At 3,15 the LXX read βασιλεὺς Ἰσραηλ (cf. Mark 15,32 par.) κύριος ἐν μέσῳ σου, οὐκ ὄψη κακὰ οὐκέτι. That Zeph 3,16-17 interested the evangelists (see Jn 12,15) has often been suspected. Hence the LXX rendering is important. Several words suit us. At 17 *yah·riš* is rendered καινιεῖ which proves that ὕρηϛ (1: he will form or work; 2: he will be silent or ignore) was used in the form ὕρδϛ (i. e. *y·hadēš*), a palaeographical commonplace (D for R); therefore 'he shall renew and/or repair'. God, in the midst of his assembly, will renew and repair: and that is what Jesus is about: *silently*, especially with the Woman, where his act only seems to be unconscious. At 19 we have σώσω (N. B.) τὴν ἐκπεπλεγμένην, which astoundingly fits a woman whose complaint extrudes that which should be inside, or is herself squeezed and falls back within a crowd.

Of course the mercy of the divine Bridegroom is the topic of the passage. A mighty one saves (*gibôr yôš'ia'*). YHWH is 'mighty to save' (Isa 63,1). Here he is the Saviour. *Gibôr* is rendered δυνατός by the LXX here and in many places. His power is of course δύναμις, a word significant to the pagans who expect it from their healers' hands⁽⁶⁷⁾, and applicable to various kinds of might⁽⁶⁸⁾. In the Sacred Marriage the Bridegroom despatches his δύναμις towards the Bride (δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου... Luke 1,34). When man's help

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Above, n. 49a.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ PLUT., *Q. Conv.* 4.1,3 (663C) cited by A. E. HARVEY, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London 1982) 108 n. 46.

(in the synagogue or the physician's bag) is vain (Pss 108,13 (12); 60,13(11)) the Mighty One joins his forces to man's (Pss 60,12(10); 108,12(11)), naturally only where there is faith. He is righteousness and power: Isa 45,24 *šdāqôṭ wā 'oz*, a passage in Paul's mind since he quotes 45,23 at Rom 14,11 (cf. Phil 2,10). Cf. Isa 63,1. 'Oz is rendered δύναμις 23 times in the LXX (cf. LXX Pss 20,1; 92,1; 139,8). The giver-out (Isa 28,29; 51,5) of 'oz to the people is none other than YHWH himself (Ps 29,11; 68,35 δύναμις). He gives power to the faint, and to him that has no might he increases strength (Is 40,29). Because Jesus works silently the divine δύναμις (Matt 28,18) comes from him (Luke 5,17; 6,19 are probably derived from our passage). It does not follow that he was unaware of it. It was not magical as was supposed about the middle of the second century⁽⁶⁹⁾ and since⁽⁷⁰⁾. To the pagan hearer δυνάμεις are θεῶν χειρὲς^(70a). Mark 5,32 περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν (fem.) need not be simply a linguistic necessity. As we shall see, there was something distinctively feminine in her movement.

Taking hold of the garment (presumably by the border and at the feet, for the sake of humility) implies, to begin with, a humble taking of refuge. Zech 8,23 is taken messianically⁽⁷¹⁾: "In those days ten men shall take hold (grasp: cf. Isa 4,11), out of all the tongues of the nations, shall even take hold (notice two takings) of the

⁽⁶⁹⁾ *Ev. sec. Petrum* 19: ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις μου, κατέλειψάς με (E. KLOSTERMANN, *Apocrypha* I, Kl.T.3, 1933; reproduced at ALAND, *Synopsis* 489). Is this indeed a rough narrative of Jesus the magician? So E. TROCMÉ, "Is there a Markan christology?", *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (ed. B. LINDARS and S.S. SMALLEY) (Cambridge 1973) 3-13, at 6.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ KERTELGE, *Wunder*, 120-125, is good. FULLER, *Interpreting*, 55-56, noticed that a magical act is converted by Mark into personal encounter (a feature enlarged at Matt 9,22). TIEDE, *Charismatic Figure*, 269. KOCH, *Bedeutung*, 137 (the situation changes after 34). From the alleged θεῖος ἀνὴρ interpretation of δύναμις there springs much imagery: HAHN cited by KUHN, *Sammlungen*, 193-198. VAN DER LOOS rightly protests against the common opinion (*Miracles*, 516). A. B. BRUCE, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, I (London 1910) 375, rightly saw that Jesus may well have divined the meaning of the touch.

^(70a) WEINREICH, *Heilungswunder*, 37, 49. Plutarch quoted at n. 68 above.

⁽⁷¹⁾ *Pesiqta Rabbati* 36.2 (above). See *b. Ta'an*. 23b!

skirt (*kānāf*, κρασπέδου) of a Jewish man, saying 'We shall go with you, for we have heard (LXX ἀκηκόαμεν, Mark 5,27 ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) God is with you'. In the pattern of the Sacred Marriage this will call forth δύναμις from the possessor of 'oz. Cf. Matt 1,5 Βοόζ. Boaz was an *'iš gibôr* (Ru 2,1)⁽⁷²⁾. The 'oz of YHWH resides even in his garments (*lāvēš 'oz*: Ps 93,1; *livēšī 'oz*: Isa 51,9). The garments express his attributes⁽⁷³⁾. One touches them to place oneself under his power, under his protection (Ru 2,12; Ps 17,8; 36,7; 57,1; 61,4; 63,7, etc.). One who goes under the garment of the Saviour is "clothed with the garment of salvation (*bigdē yeša'*), covered with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom (priest-like) decks with ornaments, and as a bride adorns with her jewels" (Isa 61,10). The garment carries what anthropologists have called *mana* (Ezek 44,19), an idea by no means confined to Jews⁽⁷⁴⁾.

The suggestion that the *hem* of his garment was a means of safety is raised by Mark later in his editorial composition at 6,53-56, the meaning of which is obvious: all may be *saved* (ἐσφύζοντο) in their weakness (κακῶς ἔχοντας, ἀσθενούντας) by contact with even the remotest physical appurtenances of Jesus. Yet just there Mark seems to contradict what he has already chosen as a paradigm at 5,27-30! Here the woman touches Jesus secretly; there the sick and/or their friends beseech Jesus (παρεκάλουν cf. 5,23). His assent was normally requisite, and the singularity of 5,27-30 is emphasised. Now Boaz's garment was lifted from his body without his approbation. He reacted with a dialogue; so does Jesus. The symbolic 'marriage' occurred once only; later the healer participated consciously in the two-way procedure of charismatic healing.

At least as important as the 'refuge' aspect of the garment is another, obvious since it was realised that to pluck at a man's garment was, on a woman's part, an overture of sexual implica-

⁽⁷²⁾ Boaz may be read as *b'oz*, 'strong' (Prov 24,5: *gever ḥākām bā'oz*, "a wise man is strong"); *Ruth Rab.* VI.4 (Soncino trans. 81).

⁽⁷³⁾ *Pesiqta Rabbati* 37.2 (trans. BRAUDE, II, 688-689). *Deut. Rab.* II 37.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ ARRIAN, *Anab. Alex.* 6.13,3 (hero); ATHEN., *Deipn.* V.212F (κὰν προσάψασθαι τῆς ἐσθῆτος). Cf. A. M. RIHBANY, *The Syrian Christ* (London 1919) 276-277.

tions⁽⁷⁵⁾. And of course ἄπτω has sexual connotations (Gen 20,6; 1 Cor 7,1; John 20,17(?))⁽⁷⁶⁾.

Ezekiel

Ezek 16 is vital to an understanding of our pericope. The Chapter of Rebuke is unpopular, but not unknown. I pointed to this before⁽⁷⁷⁾, but the hint has not been taken. YHWH passed by and saw an exposed female infant. He rescued it and when it reached maturity (at 12½) he richly endowed the *unadorned* child (cf. Exod 33,4-6), stained with blood, and married her. The theme of the Sacred Marriage is spelt out in detail. The moment of decision appears at 16,6 (MT, LXX):

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| wā'e'vor 'alayik wā'er'ek mitbō- | καὶ διήλθον ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ εἶδον σε |
| seseṭ b'dāmāyik wā'omar lāk b- | πεφυρμένην ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ⁽⁷⁸⁾ |
| dāmāyik ḥayī wā' omar lāk b'dā- | καὶ εἶπά σοι Ἐκ τοῦ αἵματός |
| mayik ḥayī. | σου ζωή. |

Rabbinical tradition exploits the double 'In thy blood live', for Israel lives through circumcision and the Passover⁽⁷⁹⁾. Our Woman was unadorned (due to poverty) and in a sense 'struggling helplessly' in her blood. The Girl was 'in her blood', prostrate in her menarche. Mark fathers upon Jesus the quaint phrase (v. 41) σοὶ λέγω, alluding to Ezek 16,6. Twice YHWH told the Daughter of Jerusalem to 'live' (in Ezekiel): the third and conclusive time was from the mouth of Jesus. The episode is an earnest of the Resurrection, promised in the words yihyū (LXX ἀναστήσονται, ΑΣΘ ζήσονται) and yeqūmūn (LXX ἐγερθήσονται; all other versions ἐξυπνισθήσονται!) at Isa 26,19!

⁽⁷⁵⁾ PLUT., *Sylla* 35,3-5 (a woman introduces herself to the dictator by plucking at his outer garment). Critical scholars frequently mention this episode — it is therefore currently considered relevant.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ And see PLATO, *Laws* 8.840A; JOS., *Ant.* 1,163; PLUT., *Alex.* 21.9, *M. Ant.* 1. 17,13. S. LIEBERMAN, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York 1965) 40.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ DERRETT, *Studies in the New Testament*, II (Leiden 1978) 42 (formerly at *Studia Evangelica*, VI [Berlin 1973] 89).

⁽⁷⁸⁾ A Greek version called 'Hebrew' read ὕγρασις (in thy amniotic fluid).

⁽⁷⁹⁾ *Pesiqta Rabbati* 17.3 (trans. BRAUDE, I, 365).

Ruth

Boaz and Ruth, models of chastity, ancestors of the Messiah, are a symbol of the Sacred Marriage. The Book of Ruth makes this clear, and *haggadah* thereon confirms this. Ruth, a proselyte, is also a paradigm of taking refuge with the Deity. The key word is *kānāf*, literally 'wing', also edge or border of a garment⁽⁸⁰⁾. *Kānāf* implies wing, lap, protection (Tg. *Sheni* Esth 9,14). With 'wing' is connected 'pinion'⁽⁸¹⁾, which, when folded, implies *back*⁽⁸²⁾. One who places herself under a person's wing (Matt 23,37/Luke 13,34!) can conveniently do so from the side, or from the back (Mark 5,27 ὀπισθεν). Because of *kānāf*, perhaps, Matthew and Luke write κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου instead of Mark's τῶν ἱματίων. 'To cast the garment over' means to *transfer merit* to as illustrated by the famous story of R. Meir and Elisha ben Abuyah (both born before A. D. 70). R. Meir, citing Ru 3,13, transferred merit to Elisha by casting his robe over the latter's grave (*Ru. Rab.* VI. 4; *Qoh. Rab.* VII. 8,1). Therefore it can imply to adopt, at any rate in the case of a male, and at any rate where it contains charisma (1 Kgs 19,19; 2 Kgs 2,8). Κράσπεδον is the hem or border, and renders *kānāf* at Deut 22,12; Zech 8,23, also Symmachus at 1 Sam 15,27. It need not mean *šīšit* (fringe or tassel) as often supposed^(82a). Of course if one *grabs* the hem (1 Sam 15,27 περὺγιον) it may tear off, since it is only sown on.

Boaz addresses Ruth as θύγατερ (2,8) though she is a *na'arā* (2,5-6); nevertheless, tutored by Naomi, she came under the wings of YHWH (*kenāfāyw*, LXX πτέρυγας 2,12), and subsequently uncovered Boaz's feet, i. e. lifted his garment (3,4.7 ἀποκαλύψεις τὰ πρὸς ποδῶν, a sexual invitation, cf. Deut 22,30, where Aquila renders with περὺγιον as with Ru 3,9 LXX). Boaz had already given her a

⁽⁸⁰⁾ See the dictionaries.

⁽⁸¹⁾ See dictionaries, s.v. *'ēver*, *'evrā*. Deut 32,11; Ps 91,4.

⁽⁸²⁾ Ps 91,4 (LXX Ps 90,4).

^(82a) Commentators noting Num 15,36; Ezek 8,3 LXX (κράσπεδον) have too readily assumed 'fringe'; BRAUDE at his trans. of *Pesiḳta Rabbati*, II, 683 n. 16. A. EDERSHEIM, *Life* (I, 626 n. 1) admits it need not be *šīšit*. On κράσπεδον as 'hem' see APPIAN, *Bell. Civ.* I, 68; AEL. ARISTID. 47.3 (Lenz-Behr, I, 528); ATHEN., 4, p. 154D; 9, p. 374A.

hint in his invitation to eat (2,14 ὥρα τοῦ φαγεῖν πρόσελθε ὧδε καὶ φάγεσαι . . .) and Naomi shrewdly followed it up.

Asians in general are sensitive about feet, which are on the one hand the least worthy part of the body (suggesting excretory organs: 1 Sam 24,3, etc.), and also sexually significant. One is sensitive about one's skirt (1 Sam 24,4-5.11). When Boaz finds Ruth at his feet she directly asks him (3,9) to spread his skirt (*kānāf*, πτερύγιον) over her. He, being righteous, does not take advantage of this invitation, but he arranges her marriage to himself in the most public manner, with due attention to the financial arrangements!

'Spreading the skirts' recalls Ezek 16,8. When it was 'ēt *dodīm*, i. e. the season when she reached maturity, *wā'efroś kēnāfi 'ālayik*, "I spread my skirt, i. e. borders (LXX τὰς πτέρυγας) over thee", *wā'akaseh 'erwātēk*, "and I covered thy nakedness/shame". Coming beneath the garment she came under the 'pinions' on the back, with which YHWH protects his worshippers (Deut 32,11 occurs in a passage recalling Ezek 16; and cf. Ps 91,4; in both cases the LXX have μετάφρενα, a part of the body which by coincidence may interest women in love-play)⁽⁸³⁾.

Editorial Work

'Jairus' Daughter' and 'The Haemorrhaging Woman' were distinct stories, and even when combined they betray, stylistically, their independent origins⁽⁸⁴⁾. The parallel between the Woman and Ruth is recondite and the fruit of meditation. However, Jesus, his garment touched *inopinato*, and his hem, perhaps, lifted, must have realised that some woman wanted *protection* from him. Many had fallen at his feet (like Jairus): only this person grabbed his garment. Woven together each story participates in features of the other, by contact and also by comparison. The Girl shares her 'daughterness' with the Woman, and the Woman her 'blood' with

⁽⁸³⁾ LUCIAN, *Dial. meret.* 4.2 (LCL VII, 374).

⁽⁸⁴⁾ ROCHAIS, *Récits*, 59. DIBELIUS regarded the coupling of the two stories as pre-Markan (*Formgeschichte*, 68-69, 320). See n. 2 above. Yet Mark did little redactional work up to 34 and much at 35-43. KOCH, *Bedeutung*, 136-139. Mark combined the two episodes (*ibid.* 138). So P. J. ACHTEMEIER, *JBL* 89 (1970) 265ff., at 277-278.

the Girl, and so on. Astoundingly, 5,35 tells us that unconsciously Jairus would strip Jesus of his life-giving, status-asserting (Mark 12,38 par.) robe, for though σκύλλω was commonly used to mean 'molest', it never lost the reminiscence of its literal meaning, 'to strip', as the garments of a worsted foe⁽⁸⁵⁾!! The irony of 5,35, noticed above, is redoubled. A synagogue-manager most certainly cannot usurp the role of a charismatic.

The Sacred Marriage, inaugurated by a Covenant so long ago, repeatedly frustrated, is at last consummated perfectly, conformably to Ezekiel, Hosea, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. This interpretation of the pericope can be shown by its position in Mark. The surface of the gospel reveals innumerable debts to the prophets, in no perfect or predictable sequence (*pace* Goulder)⁽⁸⁶⁾; yet beneath that surface is a pattern, quaint, unexpected^(86a), intriguing, of the adventures of the Old Testament's Jesus (Joshua), and of his predecessor (Moses), and the frustration of their joint scheme. The matrix upon which Mark has assembled his stories of Jesus is a sequence of ideas rather than *pārāsōt* taken from the Hexateuch and the beginning of Judges. Editorial policy has selected the features of the Jesus stories which might loosely link them, respectively, with the unfulfilled pattern of the First Redemption. The tale of that Redemption can be told without the details of certain elements, viz. Offerings, and Laws. Under the new dispensation, which completed all that went wrong and was lacking after the invasion of the Holy Land by Joshua, neither offerings nor laws were relevant. Taking these very

⁽⁸⁵⁾ LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, *Lexicon*, 2105 is not so useful here as P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque. Histoire des mots*, III (1974) 1023-1024.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ M. GOULDER, *The Evangelists' Calendar* (London 1978).

^(86a) No awareness of this scheme appears in, e.g., J. RADERMAKERS, "L'Évangile de Marc. Structure et théologie", *L'Évangile selon Marc* ed. M. Sabbe (Gembloux 1974) 221-239, but a reference to the influence of the Moses-saga appears at ACHTEMEIER, *JBL* 91 (1972) 202-203, and the influence of the story of Joshua at P. W. BARNETT, *NTS* 27 (1981) 679-697 at 691 referring to Acts 3,15; 5,31; Heb 2,10; 12,2 and W. L. KNOX, *Some Hellenistic Elements* (Cambridge 1944) 26 n. 1. Also Syb. Or. V. 256-259. C. F. Evans found, as is well known, that the Great Central Section of Luke was designed on a matrix supplied by Deuteronomy, a work which I do not find followed in Mark. Parallels between Mk 5,35-8,10 and 1 Sam 17 - 2 Sam 4 are shown by M.D. GOULDER, *The Evangelists' Calendar*, 278-279.

substantial sections out of the Hexateuch, a general correspondence is discernable, though the hooks upon which the Jesus stories are hung are often quaint, and by no means features that we should have chosen. But then we should not have employed such a principle of selection and presentation. It must be remembered that Old Testament stories were used ambivalently: on the one hand they offered authenticity, 'legitimation'; on the other they afford a contrast—Jesus did better than Moses, and much better than Joshua. A single example suffices: compare the extremely negative and consistently harsh attitude of Moses towards women, with that of Jesus!

Lest what follows should be dismissed as 'far-fetched' and 'fan-ciful', I comment *haec quae non prosunt singula, multa iuvant*. The episodes I investigated earlier and which provide most of our supporting material were worked out long anterior to this study, and their mutual corroboration is remarkable.

| | |
|--|--|
| Mark 2,18ff. No fasting with the Bridgroom. | Israel groans without YHWH: Exod 2,24 (εἰσήκουσεν); 3,9 (ἑώρακα); bridegroom (<i>hātān</i> : 4,25-26); 4,31 (ἔπεσκέψατο); 6,2-9 (λυτρώσομαι... ὀλιγοψυχίας); 12,11 (Κυρίῳ). 14 (ἐορτὴν Κυρίῳ). 16 (κλητὴ ἀγία). For the Bridgroom see 19,10-11. |
| 2,23ff. March and grain on the Sabbath ⁽⁸⁷⁾ . | Baggage, food, march to the Red Sea: Exod 12,31-40 (πρὸ τοῦ ζυμωθῆναι... ἐγκρυφίας ἄζύμους... ἐπισιτισμὸν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν). |
| 3,1ff. Paralysed arm stretched out. | Strong hand/ arm: Exod 13,3.9.14.16 (ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ), cf. Exod 14,8 (ἐν χειρὶ ὑψηλῇ); 15,12 (ἐξέτεινας τὴν δεξιάν). |
| 3,7ff. Multitude at Seaside. | Exod 12,28 (ἐπίμικτος πολὺς συνανέβη); 13,18 (εἰς τὴν... θάλασσαν), 14,2. |
| 3,13ff. Choosing XII κηρύσσειν. | Exod 12,3; 14,2.15; 16,12 (λάλησον). Hexateuchal appointments: Num 1,4-5 (παραστήσονται). 17 (ἀνακληθέντας). 44; 13,4 (ἐξαπέστειλεν); Josh 3,12; 4,4 (ἀνακαλεσάμενος). |

(87) DERRETT, *Studies*, I (Leiden 1977) 87-95.

- 3,20ff. Beelzebul, a house divided. The traitors Dathan and Abiram and the idol Baal Zephon: Exod 14,2 (*Tg. Ps.-J.*)⁽⁸⁸⁾. 9.
- 3,31ff. Mother, brothers, obedience to God. Exod 14,10-14 (ὁμοῖς σιγήσετε) (*Tg. Ps.-J.*, four parties emerge).
- 4,1-34. Parables by the Sea. The Word led to the Sea: Exod 13,18-20 (*Tg. Yer.*); the Word fought for Israel in Egypt: Exod 14,25.31 (*Tg. Ps.-J.*). Speaking by the Word: Exod 15,10 (*Tgs.*); Belief in Moses: Exod 14,31.
- 4,35ff. Calming a storm. Exod 14,11 (τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας;). The Exodus: Exod 14,20-22 (*MT, Pal. Tgs.*); 15,10 (ἐκάλυπεν... θάλασσα).
- 5,1ff. Gerasene demoniac⁽⁸⁹⁾. Discomfiture of Egyptians: Exod 14, 23-30 (εἶδεν... τεθνηκότας).
- 5,21ff. Girl and Woman. A ruler of the people: Exod 18,21.25-26. Touch not: Exod 19,12 (*qāṣeh*). Sacred Marriage: Exod 19,10.14-15. The Angel: removal of sickness, no barren woman: Exod 23,26. Blood of Covenant: Exod 24,8.
(*Laws, Offerings, and Census omitted.*)
- 6,1ff. Rejection at Nazareth. People want to stone Moses: Exod 17,4; Num 14,5.10. They reject Moses: Exod 32, 23; cf. 20, 2-3; 21,5. Want of faith: Num 14,11 (οὐ πιστεύουσι)^(89a). 22.
- 6,7ff. Mission of XII. Captains of the tribes: Num 10,14-16. Princes: Num 34,18-28; unhappy outcome: Num 13,1-14,38 (cf. Josh 18,4-10).
- (ὁποδεδεμένους σανδάλια καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσθητε δύο χιτῶνας: 9) Num 13,23: *bamoṭ bišnāyim*. The miraculous garments of the Forty Years: Num 14,34; Deut 2,7; 8,4; 29,4-6.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ DERRETT, *Studies*, III (1982) 48.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ *Ibid.*

^(89a) Num 14,11 connects with Lk 10,35-15, the Q counterpart to Mk 6,11.

- 6,14ff. Death of Baptist. Abortive attempts and defeat: Num 14,39-45; death of Aaron (and of Moses foretold): Num 20,12.28. Appointment of Joshua (Exod 33,11): Num 27,15-23 (see Dt 34,9). (*Census and Offerings omitted.*)
- 6,30ff. Feeding of 5,000. Get provisions ready: Josh 1,11.
- 6,45ff. Walking on water⁽⁹⁰⁾. Crossing the Jordan: Josh 3-4.
- 6,53ff. Healing the sick at Genesaret. Memorial of the Crossing (the Law!): Josh 4,21-5,1.
- 7,1ff. Traditions of elders. Joshua's legislation: Num 34,17⁽⁹¹⁾. Conditions: Josh 1,15-16; the settlement: Josh 2,24. Reading the Law: Josh 8,35 (Jdg 2,7).
- 7,24ff. Syrophoenician Woman (ἀκούσασα 25). Heathen kings hear (ἤκουσαν) of the Crossing: Josh 5,1. For geography see Josh 1,3; 24,17-18.
- 7,31ff. Decapolitan Deaf and Dumb Man.
- 8,1ff. Feeding of 4,000. Question of bread. Joshua, the Gibeonites and their bread: Josh 9,14; 10,6-15 (τοῦ ἐπιστισμοῦ αὐτῶν).
- 8,11ff. Refusal (?) of Signs⁽⁹²⁾. Joshua magnified: Josh 4,7.14.24. His signs of Jericho: Josh 6,2-27, cf. 24,17; at Gibeon: 10,12.
- 8,14ff. Leaven and bread. Passover: Josh 5,10,11 (ἄζυμα). Manna ceased: Josh 5,12.
- 8,22ff. Blind Man at Bethsaida (military overtones)⁽⁹³⁾. Joshua's warfare: 5,14-15; Joshua takes Bethsaida, etc.: Josh 12,1-2.
- 8,27ff. Confession at Caesarea Philippi, and spiritual warfare (for the sinful generation see Exod 14, 11, *Pal. Targ.*; Dt 1,35; 2,14; 31,27-29; 32,5). Joshua takes Baal Gad near Caesarea Philippi: Josh 11,17; 12,7; Joshua's warfare: Josh 11,18-19.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ DERRETT, "Why and how Jesus walked on the Sea", *NT* 23 (1981) 330-48.

⁽⁹¹⁾ The rules of Jewish life in the Land were held to have been stipulated for by Joshua before he settled it after the Conquest: *t. B. Qam.* VIII (see Z. W. FALK, *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth*, II [Leiden 1978] 181-182).

⁽⁹²⁾ The common opinion is that εἰ (as in Mark 8,12 εἰ δοθήσεται) is a denial as with an oath. But since εἰ (for εἰ μὴν) is said to be found in the LXX implying an asseveration, εἰ δοθήσεται may mean 'it shall certainly be given'. The question must be held over.

⁽⁹³⁾ DERRETT, *Studies*, III (1982) 107ff. (formerly at *ST* 35 [1981] 33-54).

- 9,2ff. Transfiguration (μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ): Moses came before and Elijah after⁽⁹⁴⁾. Exod 4,27-31; 24,12-18. For Phineas (Joshua's Elijah) see below. Joshua's fame after six days: Josh 6,3.14-15.27.
- 9,14ff. Demonised boy, the world into which Jesus comes down⁽⁹⁵⁾. Failure to drive out inhabitants incurs curses: Josh 13,2.13 (cf. 11,19-23); 23,15-16 (Lev 26,14-39; Dt 28,15-68).
- 9,33ff. Greatness in service. Greatness in power; children of Joseph: Josh 17,14-18 (below).
- 9,38ff. Solidarity in power. Caleb's miraculous strength and independent authority: Josh 14,6-15.
- 10,1ff. Divorce. Marriage, dowry, inheritance: Josh 15,16-20; 23,12-13.
- 10,13ff. Little children blessed⁽⁹⁶⁾. Jacob's blessings take effect: Josh 16-17. Joshua's blessing: Josh 22,4.6.
- 10,17-31. Rich enquirer. Sharing riches: Josh 22,6-8 (below).
- 10,35ff. Request for office by James and John (οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι). Rewards: house of Joseph: Josh 17,14-18; 22,6-9. Lot: Josh 15-19. Joshua, appointed himself, never appointed a successor (cf. 1,5).
- 10,46ff. Bartimaeus at Jericho; discards clothing (49); demands vision (51b). Signs at Jericho: Josh 10,12; 24,11.17. Renunciation of property at Jericho: Josh 6,17-18.
- 11,1-17. Triumphal Entry; Cleansing of Temple⁽⁹⁷⁾. Dispute over Temple, the altar of witness: Josh 22,11-23.26-29.34. Phineas (a prophet) an arbiter and peacemaker: 22,13.31-2.
- 11,18. Priests and scribes defer to people (cf. 11,27; 12,12). Levites depend on the people: Josh 21,1-3.8.13 (Num 35,2ff.). Josh 21,44-45 show implications.
- 11,27ff. Authority. Joshua's authority: Josh 22,2; 23,1-14; 24,5.11.
- 12,1ff. Wicked Vinedressers. YHWH does not forgive: Josh 23,16; 24,19.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Elijah was Phineas reborn: references at DERRETT, *Law in the New Testament* (London 1970) 188, 344.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ The curses in Deut 28 are shown in operation. The point comes up again indirectly at Acts 8,21-23.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Jesus blesses children as Jacob blessed Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen 48).

⁽⁹⁷⁾ DERRETT, "The Zeal of the House and the Cleansing of the Temple", *Downside Rev.* 95, no. 319 (1977) 79-94.

- 12,13-17. Tribute to Caesar. Josh 23,7-8 (not to mix with nations). 13,16; cf. Exod 23,31-33; Num 33,56.
- 12,18-27. The God of the Patriarchs. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: Josh 24, 1-5 (YHWH speaks). Josh 1,6 (the Land). Cf. Exod 32,13.
- 12,28-34. The Great Commandment. Josh 24,16-24 (μη γένοιτο . . . καταλιπεῖν).
- 12,35-37 David's Son (τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου). Josh 24,13 (choice of service). 15,18,21-22,24.
- 12,38-40. Woe to scribes and Pharisees, widows.
- 12,41-44. Widow's mite. Judg 2,1-4,3 (effects of disobedience) (in the light of Exod 22,24).
- 13,1ff. Woes.

Whatever Moses may have done to espouse the Children of Israel to YHWH at Mt. Sinai, the *'ahavâ* and the *hesed* which were then missing from the terms found at Hos 2,19-20 are at last supplied by Jesus, who, in the nick of time, enabled the Daughters of Sion, who ἐσχάτως ἔχουσιν, to 'live'.

Opinions differ as to whether Mark himself placed these two females in this juxtaposition. The extraordinary appropriateness of several prophetic passages to the two females when actually *found* cannot have provided a stimulus to *search* for them. How many of the details go directly back to tradition? At any rate it is quite impossible to imagine Jesus saying to his disciples, "Boys (John 21,5), be on the look-out for a woman having a menorrhagia/uterine swelling/bleeding piles, so that we may fulfil Hab 2,4 in her!" The alternative is that the narrative was biblically 'documented' *ex post facto*: and there is no objection to that having been done, after the Anastasis of Jesus which *de facto* constituted him identical with the Bridegroom of Israel. I am content to believe that the design of 5,21-43 is very substantially Mark's own. I regret that I have very inadequately expounded here a masterpiece which has defeated critics since the apostolic age.

Half Way House, High St.
Blockley, near Moreton-in-Marsh,
Gloucestershire GL56 9EX,
England.

J. Duncan M. DERRETT

SOMMAIRE

Mc 5,21-43 combine deux histoires originellement indépendantes afin de manifester la venue de l'époux vers sa bien-aimée, la fille de Jérusalem. Dans le cadre du Cantique des Cantiques et de Ruth, nous avons le substitut chrétien de l'universel *hieros gamos*, un thème d'une puissante beauté à l'intérieur du Judaïsme. Aucune des deux histoires n'est complètement détachée de son ancrage en réminiscence bien que, dans le cas de la femme, une ambiguïté délibérée plane sur la nature exacte de sa requête. C'est *comme si* c'était un problème concernant sa fécondité. Dans le cas de la fille de Jaïre, il n'y a guère de doute. La multitude d'allusions aux livres prophétiques éclaire les insinuations au sujet de la véritable identité de Jésus. La place de l'épisode dans l'évangile tend à confirmer que Marc concevait ce récit comme une preuve que l'œuvre commencée par Dieu avec l'aide de Moïse, puis de son successeur, Josué, œuvre avortée par désobéissance et incompetence, est finalement menée à bon terme. C'est rendu possible par la foi latente et patente du peuple juif, mais plus encore par la *hesed* permanente de Dieu, fidèle à son alliance et à son épouse.

Inverted Quotations in the Bible A Neglected Stylistic Pattern*

A close reading of Sirach reveals a stylistic figure which occurs in the biblical texts as well as in others. For some reason the figure as such has not been discussed in exegetical literature; yet it is common enough to deserve such discussion.

Sir 46,13-20

My first notice of this stylistic device came while examining the passage about Samuel in Sir 46,13-20⁽¹⁾. This text is completely in the *third person* singular. The only exception is the third line of verse 19, because there the *first person* singular is suddenly used⁽²⁾:

* In order to show up the specific characteristics of the *inverted quotation* as clearly as possible, the scriptural texts in this article have been translated by me from Greek and Hebrew directly as literary as possible. Precisely where it is necessary to obtain an accurate comparison between two specific texts, the existing Bible translations (for example the *RSV* and the *NEB*, and even the *King James Version*) are too free in their rendering of the original text.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. my thesis, *Jesus Sirach en Tenach*. Een onderzoek naar en een classificatie van parallellen, met bijzondere aandacht voor hun functie in Sirach 45:6-26 (mit einer Zusammenfassung in deutscher Sprache: Jesu ben Sira und die hebräische Bibel. Eine Analyse und Klassifikation der Parallelen, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Hermeneutik von Sirach 45:6-26) (Nieuwegein 1981) xix 218 pp. The dissertation can be ordered at the author's address.

⁽²⁾ In manuscript *B*. that was found in Cairo, the first four stichs of Sir 46,19 are written on one single line. But the text editions all give the impression that there are two lines in the original manuscript. Strangely a number of text editions also print the extremely lengthy verse in Sir 46,20 in the same way as it occurs in Ms *B*., that is to say on one single line (cf. I. LÉVI, *L'Ecclésiastique* I (Paris 1898) 120; Fr. VATTIONI, *Ecclesiastico* [Napoli 1968] 255).

כופר ונעלם ממ[י לקח]תי

Ransom and sandals, from whom did I take them?

Jesus Sirach took this text from 1 Sam 12,3, where it says:

ומיד מי לקחתי כפר ואעלים

Now for me the issue is not the famous text-critical question with the Hebrew verbal form $w'e'a'lim^{(3)}$. It is sufficiently known that in 1 Sam 12,3 the Septuagint did not translate a verbal form, but a substantive (ὁποδήμα). This justifies the supposition that, in the Hebrew text, it found the word $ne'ālīm$ or $na'ālāyīm$ ("sandals"). And it is precisely *this* textual form which one meets with in the Hebrew as well as in the Greek text ὑποδημάτων of Sir 46,19°. So apparently in very early days, already *two* Hebrew text forms of 1 Sam 12,3 were in circulation. The Masoretes preferred the reading $w'e'a'lim$ 'ēnay bō ("and I did blind my eyes with it") to the textual form with $ne'ālīm$ ("sandals"), that has been handed down in the Septuagint version of 1 Sam 12,3 and also in the Hebrew and Greek text of Sir 46,19°. In the three latter cases the combination 'ēnay bō is understood as 'nh bō ("to answer"). In 1 Sam 12,3 the Vulgata left the term $w'e'a'lim$ untranslated, and this is also an indication for the problem; but in the *Nova Vulgata* (1979) this was remedied: *ut oculos meos clauderem*.

However the question how Jesus Sirach adopted the quotation from 1 Sam 12,3 is much more interesting than this text-critical matter. He did not just simply copy these words from Samuel's valedictory address, but he introduces an interesting change in the sequence of the parts of sentences. As a matter of fact he takes them over in precisely the *reversed* sequence:

ומיד מי לקחתי כפר ואעלים

כופר ונעלם ממ[י לקח]תי

Here we meet with a literary process which is to be found in many more texts. But apparently up to now it has escaped the

⁽³⁾ See *BHS*, and H. J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII,1; Gütersloh 1973) 232.

attention of exegetes and other researchers of literature⁽⁴⁾. Therefore there is no current technical term for this remarkable literary phenomenon. In view of the most striking characteristic of this stylistic figure, I thought that *inverted quotation* would be the most suitable name.

In order to get better acquainted with the stylistic figure of the *inverted quotation* I shall follow three phases:

- first a number of examples from the Old Testament will be described (Section I);
- second we shall draw attention to some very fascinating texts in the New Testament where the *inverted quotation* plays an important part (Section II);
- third we shall endeavour to classify according to their type all the examples dealt with (Section III).

I. Inverted quotations in the Old Testament

1) Commentaries on the book Ezekiel usually remark that Ezek 9,9^b is like Ezek 8,12, but no one has ever explained that there is a clear example of an inverted quotation⁽⁵⁾:

Ezek 8,12

כִּי אֹמְרִים

אֵין יְהוָה רָאָה אֶתָּנוּ⁽⁶⁾

עֹב יְהוָה אֶת הָאָרֶץ

Ezek 9,9

כִּי אֹמְרוּ

עֹב יְהוָה אֶת הָאָרֶץ

וְאֵין יְהוָה רָאָה

⁽⁴⁾ The only author who has ever raised the matter of a comparable phenomenon is M. SEIDEL, "Resemblances between the book Isaiah and the Psalms" [Hebrew], *Sinai Yarhon* 19 (1955-1956) 149-172; 229-240; 273-280; 333-353. It is especially thanks to M. WEISS that the articles of Seidel have not been forgotten. In *Bib* 42 (1961) 279 the former summarised the principal thoughts of Seidel — although in my opinion, in a rather distorted way. In my thesis *Jesus Sirach en Tenach*, 62-71, I point out that Seidel's theory is often somewhat forced.

⁽⁵⁾ "Zum zweitenmal wird dabei die lästerlich-entschuldigende Rede vom Fernsein Jahwes, die in 8,12 im Munde der für das politische Leben verantwortlichen Ältesten zu hören war, laut...", W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BKAT XIII/I; Neukirchen 1969) 230.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. *BHS* and *LXX*.

For they say:

The LORD does not see (us),
the LORD has forsaken the
land.

For they have said:

The LORD has forsaken the
land,
the LORD does not see.

Both texts belong to the same composition (namely Ezek 8-11)(⁷) and both times they refer to the situation in which the prophet finds himself. The *qatal-form* of the introductory *verbum dicendi* in Ezek 9,9 (*kî 'āmrû*) hardly leaves any doubt that here words are repeated which have been spoken elsewhere (namely in 8,12). And there certainly is a very definite tie between both chapters: Ezek 8 voices the accusation and hereupon, in Ezek 9, the punishment is carried out. The two cornerstones of the prophetic speech (accusation and announcement of the judgement) are bound together indissolubly in Ezek 9,9 precisely by the *inverted quotation*.

2) When one compares Gen 27,29^b to Num 24,9^b, one remarks that, beside the similarity in words, the elements in this saying have changed places with regard to one another.

Gen 27,29

אָרִיךְ אָרוּר
וּמְבָרֵךְ בְּרוּךְ

Num 24,9

מְבָרֵךְ בְּרוּךְ
וְאָרִיךְ אָרוּר

Who curses you be cursed,
who blesses you be blessed.

Who blesses you be blessed,
who curses you be cursed.

It is hardly a coincidence that these two texts are so similar. They both belong to a passage wherein Jacob/Israel's position with regard to the nations is described very explicitly. But not only the contents are the same both times. The form also shows a remarkable similarity. Within the larger frame of the prose narrative wherein they are set, Gen 27,29 and Num 24,9 are distinguished by their short, terse poetical style. This could indicate that the relevant curse and blessing are very ancient.

(⁷) See ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel*, 188-253, esp. 208-209.

Gen 12,3, which is often mentioned in the same breath with both these passages, shows a number of striking differences. For example, this saying is characterised by a chiasmic construction: *wa'ābārākā mēbārēkēkā ūmēqallelkā 'ā'ōr*, while Gen 27,29 and Num 24,9 have a strict *parallelismus membrorum*. Of course this is a difference in shade, and one could not take too much of it. But it is a fact that a different construction of Gen 12,3 makes a *direct* relationship to the two texts mentioned less probable. Moreover it must be remarked that, in the second half of Gen 12,3^a the verb 'rr is not accompanied by a "paronomastisches Objekt⁽⁸⁾", and that therefore there are not two, but three verbs. One could also note that it is precisely the participial form of that "added" verb *qll* which has been text-critically contested⁽⁹⁾. And because Gen 12,3^a moreover contains a formulation in the 1st person singular (in God's mouth), which has evidently been written for that situation, the surmise is justified that Gen 27,29 and Num 24,9 are from an earlier time⁽¹⁰⁾. There is no answer to the question: which of the older passages was the model for the other one. Probably the passage in Num 24,29 is older than the one in Gen 27,29. But one of the most difficult questions regarding the Balaam cycle (Num 22–24) is precisely that of a more or less trustworthy dating of the various parts⁽¹¹⁾.

3) No one doubts that there is a clear connection between the book Ezekiel and the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26. Thus there is an unmistakable relationship between Lev 26,3–13 and Ezek 34,25–30. This is especially apparent in a strong resemblance regarding vocabulary⁽¹²⁾. If we take a closer look, we at once notice an *inverted quotation* in these passages:

⁽⁸⁾ C. BROCKELMANN, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen 1956) Paragraph 91; P. JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 21956) 125p.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. *BHS*.

⁽¹⁰⁾ C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis* (BKAT 1,2; Neukirchen 1981) 174. He puts the passage in a "vorstaatlichen Zeit" (*ibid.*, 175). "Die Umbildung, in der Jahwe der Handelnde ist, ist erst von J formuliert" (*ibid.*, 175). The analysis of J. VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven 1975) 271–278 contains more or less the same conclusions.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. W. GROSS, *Bileam* (SANT; München 1974).

⁽¹²⁾ Ezek 34,25^b and Lev 26,6^b; Ezek 34,27^a and Lev 26,4^b; Ezek 34,27^b and Lev 26,13^b; Ezek 34,28^b and Lev 26,5^b–6^a.

Lev 26,4^bEzek 34,27^a

ונתנה הארץ יבולה
ועץ השדה יתן פריו

ונתן עץ השדה את פריו
והארץ תתן יבולה

And the land shall yield its in-
crease,
and the trees of the field shall
yield their fruit.

And the trees of the field shall
yield their fruit,
and the land shall yield its in-
crease.

There is no unanimous opinion regarding the question in which of the two passages the other one was originally found⁽¹³⁾, nonetheless the following remarks seem important to me: a) Zimmerli, who is convinced that the prophet Ezekiel was clearly influenced by Lev 17–20, has another opinion regarding Lev 26: "dass die Prophetie Ezechiels auf die Ausgestaltung von H zurückgewirkt hat...⁽¹⁴⁾. b) In his analysis of Lev 26, Elliger has clearly demonstrated that, as far as composition is concerned, the chapter is no unity but that, in a gradual process of tradition, it has absorbed all kinds of new themes⁽¹⁵⁾.

One could compare the chapter with which the Holiness Code in Lev 26 ends to a magnet drawing all sorts of different material. Therefore for me it is indubitable that the passage in Ezek 34,27^a served as a model for the *inverted quotation* in Lev 26,4^b.

4) In Lev 26 there is another remarkable formulation, wherein the sequence of traditional elements is reversed. In Lev 26,42 it says:

וזכרתי את בריתי יעקוב
ואף את בריתי יצחק
ואף את בריתי אברהם אזכר
והארץ אזכר

⁽¹³⁾ A survey of opinions is to be found in ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel*, 77*-79*. See also: K. ELLIGER, *Leviticus* (HAT 4; Tübingen 1966); R. KILIAN, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen des Heiligkeitgesetzes* (BBB 19; Bonn 1963).

⁽¹⁴⁾ ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel*, 78*.

⁽¹⁵⁾ ELLIGER, *Leviticus*, 364-367.

"Then I will remember my covenant with Jacob,
and my covenant with Isaac too,
and my covenant with Abraham I will also remember,
and I will remember the land".

This is the only time in the entire Old Testament that the traditional sequence (Abraham — Isaac — Jacob) is given in a *reversed order*. Unanimously Lev 26,42 is viewed as secondary⁽¹⁶⁾. It is considered to be an addition, probably caused by verse 45, where the impression is created that "covenant" could only be connected with the departure from Egypt; the Priestly Code does not agree with this at all⁽¹⁷⁾. The addition in Lev 26,42 with the names of the Patriarchs in a reversed sequence can be meant to draw the attention and to stress what is going to be said⁽¹⁸⁾.

5) A comparison between the text of Ps 27,4 and Ps 23,6 leads us to the conclusion that here also one finds an *inverted quotation*:

Ps 23,6
כל ימי חיי
ושבתי בבית יהוה

Ps 27,4
שבתי בבית יהוה
כל ימי חיי

| | |
|--|--|
| All the days of my life; and I may dwell in the house of the LORD. | That I may dwell in the house of the LORD all the days of my life. |
|--|--|

Opinions are divided concerning which of the two passages must be considered the eldest. Kraus says — and he bases his point of view on commentaries that he does not name⁽¹⁹⁾ — that the words

⁽¹⁶⁾ ELLIGER, *Leviticus*, 378; M. NOTH, *Das dritte Buch Mose* (ATD 6; Göttingen 1962) 175; J. VINK, *Leviticus* (BOT 2; Roermond 1962) 96.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See especially: W. ZIMMERLI, "Sinaibund und Abrahambund. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift", *Gottes Offenbarung* (TBü 19, München 1969) 214-215.

⁽¹⁸⁾ One should also take note of the unique word combination "the covenant with the former men" (Lev 26,45).

⁽¹⁹⁾ "Dieser Fünfer wird von einigen Kommentaren als Ergänzung aus Ps 23,6 aufgefasst. Das ist sehr wahrscheinlich. Die Zeile konnte ebensogut fehlen"; H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (BKAT XV, 1; Neukirchen 1972) 221. With this he voices the views of e.g. Grimme, Buhl, Briggs, Podechard, Tournay, Duesberg and Deissler in their commentaries on Ps 27.

originally belong to Ps 23,6 and therefore have penetrated into Ps 27,4, "denn sowohl syntaktisch wie auch sachlich fügt sich dieses Stück schlecht in den Textzusammenhang⁽²⁰⁾". A similar point of view for Ps 27,4 has been included in the text critical notes of *BHK* and *BHS*. This tells us something about the consensus that apparently exists regarding this question.

The reasoning regarding the authenticity might probably just as well be the *other way round*. In Ps 27,4 the verbal form (infinitive) and the sequence of the words are more natural and more normal than in Ps 23,6, where there are problems concerning the vocalisation of *wšbty*. Are we to read *šibtî*, "my dwelling", or *šabtî*, "I return"? Then again, the words in Ps 27,4 belong to one and the same verse line, whereas in Ps 23,6 they belong to two different lines. Moreover, within Ps 27, the notion *ḥayîm* ("life") functions very clearly at the beginning (vs. 1^b) and at the end (vs. 13), so that the fact that this term lies in the heart of the prayer (vs. 6), makes it sound very authentic.

Thus there are no definitive arguments for the priority of either text, there can be no doubt that here is indeed an *inverted quotation* in one or the other.

6) If one compares Hag 1,10 and Zech 8,12 one finds a quite different *inverted quotation*. Haggai's preaching is meant to convince his audience that the bad economic situation (crop failure) must be seen as a punishment of God, because the people have stopped rebuilding the temple.

Hag 1,10

כלאו שמים מטל
והארץ כלאה יבולה

The heavens have withheld
the dew
and the earth has withheld
its increase.

Zech 8,12

והארץ תתן את יבולה
והשמים יתנו טלם

The earth shall give
its increase,
and the heavens shall give
their dew.

⁽²⁰⁾ KRAUS, *Psalmen*, 224.

The commentaries unanimously hold that the images in Zech 8,12 come from Hag 1,10⁽²¹⁾. Zechariah is reversing the negative formulation of Haggai and the figure, inverted quotation, reinforces stylistically the expression of the change from negative to positive⁽²²⁾.

7) For quite another reason a comparison between the text of Ps 83,14-16 and that of Isa 17,13^c-14^a is intriguing. Both passages deal with the same theme: God's intervention against the enemies. Furthermore *galgal* has the unusual meaning "whirling dust" only in this two passages of the Old Testament⁽²³⁾. If one sets the words which occur in Ps 83,14-16 as well as in Isa 17,13-14 in columns next to each other, then it is notable that no fewer than four words on row (A-B-C-D) from Ps 83 can be found in precisely the *reversed sequence* (D-C-B-A) in Isa 17,13-14.

Ps 83,14-16

- A. *kagalgal*
- B. *lifnê rûah*
- C. *hārîm*
- D. *tirdēfēm*
- E. *ûbēsûfâtkā*
- F. *ʔbahalēm*

Isa 17,13-14

- D. *wērûddaf*
- C. *hārîm*
- B. *lifnê rûah*
- A. *ûkēgalgal*
- E. *sûfâ*
- F. *ballāhâ*

The terms under F. also require attention. They belong to two different roots (*bhl* and *blh*), but strangely enough they have a nearly identical significance ("to frighten", resp. "fright"). It cannot be excluded, that the changing of the radicals was done on purpose in order to give extra (visual) force to the *reversion of terms*⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽²¹⁾ W. A. M. BEUKEN, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8* (Assen 1967) 156-183 and 184-207, esp. 166 and 213, n. 1.

⁽²²⁾ In this connection one could point to the word combination *hā'ādām / habbēhēmâ* ("man / cattle") that, in Zech 8,10 *precedes* the text dealt with, and *comes after* in Hag 1,11.

⁽²³⁾ In Isa 5,28 (Isa 28,28); Jer 47,3; Ezek 10,2.6; 23,24; 26,10; Ps 77,19 and Qoh 12,6 the word regularly has the meaning "wheel".

⁽²⁴⁾ SEIDEL, who draws attention to this text pair ("Resemblances", 347), does not enter at all into the transposition of the radicals; he does not even

8) In our opinion one can also find such a *selective inversion* in Mic 5,9-13 in regards to Isa 2,6-8. The similarity between both passages is generally recognised, while Isaiah's text is certainly the earlier source⁽²⁵⁾. The use of the inversion might considerably strengthen the hypothesis of A. S. van der Woude, that in Mic 5,9-14 it is a question of the opponents of the prophet Micah, who base themselves "on words of Isaiah in order to defend their own nationalistically coloured expectation of salvation and to enforce it opposite Micah with the authority of a respected prophet⁽²⁶⁾".

9) Without going into more detail, I shall now give a number of Old Testament text pairs, in which the *inverted quotation* is used⁽²⁷⁾:

Deut 32,1 and Isa 1,2; Ps 35,9 and Isa 61,10; Sir 9,5^a and Job 31,1^b; Sir 18,32 and Prov 23,20-21; Sir 20,4 and Prov 17,28; Sir 32(35),23 and Prov 19,16; Sir 45,15^{ab} and Exod 28,41; Sir 48,1 and Mal 3,19; Jonah 2,2 and Ps 120,1.

II. Inverted quotation in the New Testament

In the New Testament one also repeatedly finds the *inverted quotation*, especially in Saint Paul's letters.

1) For example, in Rom 10,20-21 the apostle quotes a rather lengthy passage from Isa 65,1-2 (LXX), and there, in an intriguing manner, he allots a different place to certain specific parts.

indicate the two different radices. Recent studies which pay attention to Isa 17,12-14 do not mention Ps 83,14-16 at all, let alone speak of a relationship between both passages: J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'Apocalyptique* (EBib; Paris 1977) Tome I, 313-316; H. BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit* (WMANT 48; Neukirchen 1977) 180-183; 205-207; 227-232; W. DIETRICH, *Jesaja und die Politik* (BEvT 74; München 1976) 135-137.

⁽²⁵⁾ VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe*, 139; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja 1-39* (BOT IX^a; Roermond 1972) 39. A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Micha* (POT; Nijkerk 1976) 180.

⁽²⁶⁾ In the texts of Ps 83,14-16 and Isa 17,13-14 there are variations on the verbs *bhl* and *blh*. This is also the case in this text pair. Isa 2,6 has namely *ntš*, and Mic 5,13 has *ntš*. I also wish to remark that the Isaiah passage has the verb *ml'* four times; the text of Micah has four times the verb *krt*.

⁽²⁷⁾ In my thesis (see n. 1) I gave a detailed analysis of each text pair.

Rom 10,20-21

Isa 65,1-2 (LXX)

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν | (b) ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν |
| (b) ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν [] | (a) εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν [] |
| (c) ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν | (d) ἐξέπετασα τὰς χεῖράς μου |
| (d) ἐξέπετασα τὰς χεῖράς μου | (c) ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν |
| (e) πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα | (e) πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα |
| (a) I was found by those who were not looking for me; | (b) I was clearly shown to those who were not looking for me; |
| (b) I was clearly shown to those who never asked about me; [] | (a) I was found by those who never asked about me; [] |
| (c) All day long | (d) I have stretched out my hands |
| (d) I have stretched out my hands | (c) all day long |
| (e) to an unruly an defiant people. | (e) to an unruly an defiant people. |

2) We also meet the same phenomenon of the *inverted quotation* in Rom 11,3, where the apostle starts quoting the words of the prophet Elijah (3 Kgs 19,10 LXX) in an inverted way:

3 Kgs 19,10 (LXX)

- (a) τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν
(b) καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ
καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος
καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν

Rom 11,3

- (b) τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν
(a) τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν

καὶ γὰρ ὑπολείφθην μόνος
καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου

3 Kgs 19,10 (LXX)

- (a) They have torn down thine altars,
- (b) and they have killed thy prophets by the sword,
and I alone am left
and they are seeking my life to take it.

Rom 11,3

- (b) They have killed thy prophets,
- (a) they have torn down thine altars,
and I alone am left
and they are seeking my life.

3) In Rom 9–11 there is at least once more an *inverted quotation*. We find it in Rom 9,25:

- (a) καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου
- (b) καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην
- (a) Those who were not my people I will call “my people”,
- (b) and the unloved I will call “beloved”.

The text from Hos 2,25, here quoted by Paul does *not* follow the words that can be read in most of the Greek manuscripts, but it is very similar to a textual form that can be found in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Venetus⁽²⁸⁾.

- (b) καὶ ἀγαπήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην
- (a) καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου λαός μου εἰ σύ
- (b) And I will love the Unloved,
- (a) and those who were not my people I will say: my people are you.

⁽²⁸⁾ For more detailed information about the Greek texts: J. ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetæ*. Septuaginta auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum Vol. XIII (Göttingen 1943) 152.

Commentaries mostly do note that in the three passages from the letter to the Romans mentioned above (Rom 9,25; 10,20-21; 11,3), Paul's sequence deviates from the Septuagint, but they rarely give an explanation why this is so. The few times that someone really looks for a solution, *theological* explanations nearly immediately start to mystify the issue. Paul reversed the sequence of sentences and words — so one contends — because in the order of salvation drastic changes took place regarding the place of the heathen. This explanation, which is to be found e.g. in the commentaries of O. Kuss and E. Käsemann⁽²⁹⁾, seems to me untenable.

If the stylistic figure of the *inverted quotation* could only be found in Rom 9-11, then the authors mentioned above would be right; but one also meets the *inverted quotation* in Paul's other letters, for instance in 2 Cor 6,17, where Isa 52,11 is quoted "upside down":

Isa 52,11 (LXX)

- (a) καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε
(b) ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῆς
ἀφορίσθητε

And touch nothing unclean,
come out from her;
be separate.

2 Cor 6,17

- (b) διὸ ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου
αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε []
(a) καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε

Come out from them,
and be separate,
and touch nothing unclean.

Those persons who try to explain the *inverted quotations* in Rom 9-11 according to theological grounds, seem to me to miss an elementary step, namely that Paul uses an evidently accepted *literary* process: the *inverted quotation*. And by using these literary technics exactly within the very heavily laden and important digression of Rom 9-11, he had at his disposal the extra *rhetorical* means to enforce his radical message. In other words: The inverted quotations do not bring about a theological turn-about in Rom 9-11. Even without them Paul would have been able to formulate his message. But the apostle uses this *literary* device in order to accentuate his theology in an expressive way⁽³⁰⁾!

⁽²⁹⁾ O. KUSS, *Der Römerbrief III* (Regensburg 1978) 780; E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen 1973), 284-285.

⁽³⁰⁾ Other (less extensive) examples of *inverted quotation* can be found in: Rom 3,14; 9,13; 11,9; 14,11; 15,11.21; 2 Cor 8,15; 1 Tim 5,18.

4) The exegetes' opinions are divided whether the description of the vineyard in Mark 12,1 goes back to Isa 5,2 LXX⁽³¹⁾. But when one compares both texts in Greek, a *model* becomes visible. Curiously enough nobody has ever described this model.

| Isa 5,2 (LXX) | Mark 12,1 |
|---|----------------------------------|
| (a) καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα | (b) ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν |
| (b) καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον | (a) καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν σωρηχ |
| (c) καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ | (d) καὶ ὥρυξεν ὑπολήνιον |
| (d) καὶ προλήνιον ὥρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ | (c) καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν πύργον |

In the Parable of the vineyard-workers in Mark 12,1 we find a more or less consequent reversal of the text from Isa 5,2 LXX. In the passage of Mark parts of the sentences from Isa 5,2 LXX have changed places mutually (the sequence a-b-c-d- in Isa 5,2 has become b-a-d-c in Mark 12,1). But that is not all, the sequence of *words* has been changed:

| Isa 5,2 (LXX) | Mark 12,1 |
|---------------|-----------|
| a — 1 — 2 | b — 2 — 1 |
| b — 1 — 2 | a — 2 — 1 |
| c — 1 — 2 | d — 2 — 1 |
| d — 1 — 2 | c — 1 — 2 |

⁽³¹⁾ "The vineyard's structure is evidently based on that of the vineyard from Isa. 5:2 (LXX)"; J. D. CROSSAN, "The Parable of the wicked husbandmen", *JBL* 90 (1971) 452. "The Parable of the Vineyard-Workers (Mk. 12:1-12), ... is introduced by an unmistakable reference to the allegory of the vineyard (= Israel) from Isa 5:1-2 ..."; H. C. KEE, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16", in: *Jesus und Paulus* (Festschrift W. G. Kümmel) (Göttingen 1975) 176. Quite differently: "Der durchweg verbreitete Ansicht, dass in V 1 Jes 5,2 LXX zitiert sei, ist als irrig abzuweisen"; R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT II,2; Freiburg 1977) 215. Among others who definitely deny a connection between Mark 12,1 and Isa 5,2 LXX: e.g. J. BLANK, "Die Sendung des Sohnes", *Neues Testament und Kirche* (Festschrift R. Schnackenburg) (Freiburg 1974) 11-41, esp. 14; R. H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, (Leiden 1967) 13.

It is most improbable that such a composition by Mark would be a coincidence. Moreover various exegetes⁽³²⁾ see in the question τί ποιήσει that concludes the parable (Mark 12,9) a parallel with τί ποιήσω in Isa 5,5 (LXX), so that the entire passage in Mark refers to the Song of the vineyard in Isa 5,1-7.

The fact that Mark, in the beginning of his Parable of the bad vineyard-workers (Mark 12,1), was able to transform the text from Isa 5,2 LXX into a very special *inverted quotation* is all the more remarkable, because in all the other places where he quotes the Old Testament, he follows more or less closely the Septuagint (cf. Mark 1,2-3; 7,6-7; 12,10-11; 12,36 etc.).

When one takes the parallel account in Matt 21,33, one notes that Matthew goes back to Mark 12,1 as far as the sequence of the sentence parts is concerned (b-a-d-c). But Matthew brings the sequence of the *words* as much as possible in harmony with the text of Isa 5,2 LXX. Martin Hengel's hypothesis — Matthew and Mark have used two different Greek translations of the Old Testament — seems untenable to me⁽³³⁾. First of all there are no manuscripts⁽³⁴⁾ which support this point of view and second, in the rest of his gospel, Mark quotes rather accurately from the Septuagint. At present it is not yet clear why he did not do that in Mark 12,1. But I am quite sure that there must be a very special reason for it. A further investigation into the use and the function of the *inverted quotation* is much needed; this goes for the Old Testament, the New Testament⁽³⁵⁾ and the early christian literature.

(32) J. JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Siebenstern-Taschenbuch 43; München 1965) 72; M. HENGEL, "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern in Mc 12:1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse", *ZNW* 59 (1968) 7 and 18; J. GNILKA, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKKNT II/2; Zürich 1979) 143, 147; P. J. FARLA, *Jezus' oordeel over Israël. Een form- en redaktionsgeschichtliche analyse van Mc 10,46-12,40* (Kampen 1978) 195 and 450.

(33) HENGEL, "Das Gleichnis", 19.

(34) Cf. J. ZIEGLER, *Isaias. Septuaginta ...* Vol. XIV (Göttingen 1939) 137.

(35) For the question whether and in what way the synoptic gospels quote each other: G. HOWARD, "Stylistic inversion and the synoptic tradition", *JBL* 97 (1978) 375-389.

III. Different types of inverted quotations

If we survey the examples of the *inverted quotations*, given up to now, it becomes evident that not all of them have the same *structure*. In view of certain characteristics, one could arrange them in five types.

1) Of course the most *spectacular* is the inverted quotation that is the exact *reflection* of another text. One meets this type e.g. in the following text pairs: Ezek 8,12 and Ezek 9,9; Gen 27,29 and Num 24,9; Ps 23,6 and Ps 27,4; Lev 26,4 and Ezek 34,27; Rom 9,25 and Hos 2,25; Rom 11,3 and 3 Kgs 19,10 (LXX).

2) Then there are the texts which, besides the characteristics of the first group, have an *extra* characteristic: through the *inverted quotation* the negative content of a text is transformed into a text with a positive message, as in Hag 1,10 and Zech 8,12^(35a).

3) Quite often one sees an *inverted quotation*, wherein a number of words (including the verb) from sentence *a* changes places with a number of words (including the verb) from sentence *b*. Examples can be found in Ps 35,9 and Isa 61,10; Isa 1,2 and Deut 32,1; Sir 45,15^{ab} and Exod 28,41; Sir 32(35),23 and Prov 19,16; Rom 10,20-21 and Isa 65,1-2 (LXX).

4) A considerable number of words (but not all) from a specific text returns in a passage with a similar theme, but in a *different sequence*. In our opinion this type could be well described by the name *selective inverted quotation*: Ps 83,14-16 and Isa 17,13-14; Mic 5,9-13 and Isa 2,6-8.

5) The last group is probably the hardest to recognise. Because in this type of *inverted quotation* the *parallelismus membrorum* is not used as it is in group 1, 2 and 3. Neither are there rather long

(^{35a}) Dr. G. Mussies, my colleague at Utrecht State University, discovered an example of this type in MAXIM OF TYRE XI, 6^c (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ θαλάττης μέτρα, οὐδὲ ἀριθμὸν ψάμμου), where there is an *inverted quotation* from HERODOTUS I,47 (οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης).

passages (as in group 4) but it is simply a question of small changes. Therefore, in many cases, this type is more difficult to recognise than the others. Still there is a change in sequence of merely a few words (mostly two, three or four): Sir 46,19^c and 1 Sam 12,3; Sir 9,5 and Job 31,1^b; Sir 18,32 and Prov 23,20-21; Sir 20,4 and Prov 17,26; Sir 48,1^b and Mal 3,19.

The fact that precisely this type of *inverted quotation* often occurs in the book of Jesus Ben Sirach is closely connected with the character and the form of his book of wisdom. The mostly short lines Jesus Ben Sirach used to write his work, are difficult material for more or less extensive inversions that can make use of the *parallelismus membrorum*. The introduction of small changes in existing texts gives this Jerusalem author the possibility to start a discussion with the written tradition of his people.

Final remarks and questions

Seeing some examples of inverted quotations (Gen 27,29 and Num 24,9; Lev 26,4 and Ezek 34,27; Ps 23,6 and Ps 27,6), the question could arise whether such a stylistic figure is not the mere result of a free rendering within an oral tradition and must be traced to a common tradition of formulaic patterns⁽³⁶⁾ or set phrases which can be used variously. In my opinion the problem can not be solved in that way. If the inversion of phrases had been a common pattern in oral biblical literature indeed, it may be wondered why this literary phenomenon then does occur only a few times in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament. Also the *inverted quotation* as a stylistic pattern in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament cannot be put aside with the disparaging remark that, in those places, the authors were quoting untidily. Because why can they be extremely accurate otherwise in their quotations in most other places of their books? Reading some examples of *inverted quotations* (Ezek 8,12 and Ezek 9,9; Lev 26,42; Sir 46,19 and 1 Sam 12,3; Hag 1,10 and Zech 8,12; Ps 83,14-16 and Isa 17,13-14; Mic 5,9-14 and Isa 2,6-8; Mark 12,1 and Isa 5,2 LXX; Rom 9-11), it is hard to avoid the impression that the biblical author did rework the original text on purpose.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. W. R. WATTERS, *Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament* (BZAW 138; Berlin 1976).

The fact that now and then we meet an *inverted quotation* must therefore mean something special. It will take much time and much study of detail before all the mysteries of this stylistic figure will have been laid open⁽³⁷⁾. At this moment we can say that in an existing formulation (a sentence, a colon, an established expression, a rare combination of words) the author reverses the sequence. And by this *deviating* model he attains a moment of extra attention in the listener (or the reader), because the latter hears something else than the traditional words⁽³⁸⁾.

Preludelaantje 6
3438 TT Nieuwegein
Netherlands

Pancratius C. BEENTJES

SOMMAIRE

Une lecture exacte d'Eccli 46,19 révèle une figure rhétorique très remarquable. Avec les mots de 1 Sam 12,3 Jésus, fils de Sira, a créé une citation inverse. Ce phénomène littéraire, que personne n'a découvert jusqu'ici, se trouve plusieurs fois dans la Bible, non seulement dans les livres hébreux de l'Ancien Testament, mais encore dans la littérature néotestamentaire, notamment dans les chapitres 9–11 de l'épître aux Romains.

⁽³⁷⁾ On the basis of my thesis the *inverted quotation* as a stylistic pattern will be included in the next edition of W. BÜHLMANN — K. SCHERER, *Stilfiguren der Bibel* (BibB 10; Einsiedeln / Klosterneuburg / Stuttgart). This literary phenomenon will probably be found under the lemma *Umkehrung*.

⁽³⁸⁾ I am greatly indebted to Mrs. W. Quarles van Ufford (Amsterdam) for her benevolence and accuracy in translating this article into English.

David's Rise: Sacral, Military, or Psychiatric?

In First Samuel 16 and 17 not two but three ill-compatible accounts of David's rise to prominence in Saul's court are juxtaposed.

It is surprising therefore to learn that no commentator ascribes to the Deuteronomist himself one of the three variants, or indeed adverts to its existence seriously at all. Our concern here is to show how the *second* of the versions of David's Debut can be inserted into existing patterns of composition maintained for the Samuel books.

1. The Three Irreducible Situations

1) In the first half of chapter 16, Samuel is discontented with Saul, and himself by God's mandate goes to find and anoint a successor. Samuel's rage had itself been traced to two incompatible cultic misdemeanors of Saul. Those sub-variants give us insight into the transit of powers from charismatic leadership to theocracy⁽¹⁾. But more relevant to our present problem are the perhaps-cognate variants in the whole story of the choice and rise of Saul himself, which also is «three-pronged» as must be noticed below.

2) In the second half of chapter 16, Saul's own courtiers go seeking a strong-armed therapist to soothe their royal master, because Saul's fits of insanity threaten to put an abrupt end to his official position and to their own fringe-benefits linked with it. This might be called the most «secular» account, and is also in closest relation to the subsequent Jonathan-saga with its own peculiar style of psychiatric overtones.

3) The third account is the Goliath-saga of chapter 17. Here Saul has never heard of David before, and himself proposes taking

⁽¹⁾ R. NORTH, "The Trauma of King Saul", *Bible Today* 29 (March 1967) 2048-2059.

him on, but as a *fighter*. No connection with Samuel or his anointing-act is hinted. God plays no active role in the action, except as implied in David's vaunt⁽²⁾. There is in 2 Sam 21,19 a Goliath of Gath slain by a Bethlehemite of David's group, but the slayer's name is given as Elhanan; this Elhanan in 1 Chr 20,5 kills 'the Bethlehemite (*laḥmî*), brother of Goliath of Gath'⁽³⁾. These variants tend to reinforce our impression that this narrative is a hero-saga. Yadin's ever-competent proof that 1 Sam 17 gives valued factual information on the *armaments* used, says of course nothing about the pristine historicity of the *event*⁽⁴⁾.

2. Concordist or structuralist approach in order?

It is not *a priori* excluded that these three narratives represent merely pinpointed aspects of a single continuous and consistent occurrence⁽⁵⁾. Samuel having seen the error of his own free choice of Saul, goes to find a better candidate to be indicated to him by God's immediate intervention. The youthful hero whom he chooses might well have been widely known in the region (despite Jesse's understandable maneuvers to keep him under cover until an older brother got tenure); meanwhile this promising David could have been sought quite independently as strong-armed musician to keep Saul quiet or eventually heal him.

Indeed Samuel might have known that such a step had already been taken; thus he would have no need to hint to David how precisely he was to go about worming his way into the zone of royalty. When in the Goliath episode Saul has never seen or heard of anyone named David ben-Jesse, this could be because David had

(2) 1 Sam 17,26.36.45ff. On this lack of religious motivation (R. H. PFEIFFER, *JBL* 70 [1951] 5) see Morton SMITH, "The So-Called 'Biography of David' (I Sam 16 — II Sam 5-9. 21-24)", *HTR* 44 (1951) 167-169.

(3) The view that Elhanan is David's birth-name (A. HONEYMAN, *JBL* 67 [1948] 23) is rejected by R. DE VAUX, "Les combats singuliers dans l'AT", *Bib* 40 (1959) 495.

(4) Y. YADIN, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands* (New York 1963) II, 165; noted by C. E. HAUSER, "The Shape of the Saulide Strategy", *CBQ* 30 (1969) 160 n. 22.

(5) Thus W. L. HUMPHREYS, "The Tragedy of King Saul: a Study of the Structure of 1 Samuel 9-31", *JStOT* 6 (1978) 23: 1 Sam 16,4 "sets the stage" for David's entry into Saul's court; 1 Sam 17 stresses not his valor but his *acceptance by Saul*.

been spirited into the household with therapeutic incognito, and Saul knew him only as one of those pink-cheeked white-coated orderlies who coped with him at times when he was not recognizing all too well what was going on.

Such concordist exegesis is of a type sadly overdone in the past. There remain indeed some undeniable cases where apparently irreducible narratives are solidly acceptable as focused aspects of a single unitary event, as we will hold below with Beyerlin. Nevertheless we may tranquilly continue to insist that the surface impression of 1 Sam 16-17 is of three *alternative* explanations ill-compatible with one another.

Granting that we are in presence of three independently-originating accounts, a commendable scholarly procedure would be to think up for them a fresh and hitherto-untried explanation, and avoid the pitfall of merely repeating or adapting what others have said. One might well excogitate "roles" — a journalist, a therapist, a pietist — who possessed no other *facts* than that David unexpectedly became dynast. Then with the use of current ("structuralist") narrative patterns, for each role-player is built up a plausible story of how it all happened⁽⁶⁾.

This approach has much to recommend it, even though it has not yet become normal in exegesis — where in any case we are bound to consider impartially the already-existing explanations even of the Fathers and of mavericks.

All in all, it seems methodologically most economical and efficient to begin with the explanation for which the most thorough groundwork has been laid, the Yahwist-Elohistic sources. The very existence of Wellhausen's J-E-P-D strands is just now (and indeed has almost continuously been) fiercely under attack. But Cazelles' massive summation concludes that however varied and cogent such attacks have been, they have never resulted in an alternative which was even briefly or locally accepted⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ H. JASON, "The Story of David and Goliath: a Folk Epic?", *Bib* 60 (1979) 36-70; the author is presented as "not a biblical scholar, but a folklorist", author of *Ethnopoetry* (1977). On p. 44 is noted that by PROPP "hero-fairytale" norms, David cannot belong to the king's court at the time he is battling Goliath (but p. 75 claims we should follow rather the SKAFTYMOV "romantic epic" norms).

⁽⁷⁾ H. CAZELLES, "Pentateuque", *DBSup* 7 (1966) 742; updated in his "Theological Bulletin on the Pentateuch", *BTB* 2 (1972) 3-24.

And meanwhile there has been an almost-equally continuous (though seldom noticed) striving to trace J and E on through the books of (Joshua of course: "Hexateuch") even Samuel and Kings. It seems only reasonable to "dispose" first of this concrete possibility, whose sharply-defined terms are so well known to all exegetes.

3. Survey of J and E proponents for 1 Sam 16-17

We may at once advert that the hero-saga of chapter 17 is in the genre of the Yahwist⁽⁸⁾. God is not aloof and omnipotent. David carrying his brothers' lunch-pail did not overlook a perquisite for their boss (1 Sam 17,18). The stones from the brook are concretely five and flat (17,40). The weapons are such as people really used in those days.

The strongly theological motivation and hieratic language of the first half of chapter 16 fits the Elohist, and the pivotal figure is a Northerner (Samuel, like Saul himself); though vocabulary-statistics and other grounds for varying source-attributions will be noted in the commentators⁽⁹⁾. By elimination, to the Deuteronomist himself (the usually supposed "real author" of Samuel) one may propose to attribute 16,14-23. This third or rather *middle* narrative gives plau-

⁽⁸⁾ This had been my conviction throughout my preparation of my Geneva 1965 IOSOT paper, "The Trilemma of David's Rise", published only as a sympathetic report in J. A. SOGGIN, *Das Königtum in Israel* (BZAW 104; Berlin 1967) 58. In giving that paper, my openness to certain alternatives (enduring even today, as will be shown below) led me to express myself in a way which SOGGIN doubtless reported faithfully but on which I offered a "rectification" in my review of his book, *CBQ* 30 (1968) 476-8. My admission that 1 Sam 16,14-23 showed J-traits was really a citation from CASPARI (below); similarly I admitted that Goliath fits some "updating tendencies" of E; as does 1 Sam 16,1-13 of the "deuteronomist redactor"; but the importance I even then attached to SCHUNCK and NÜBEL implied an overall conclusion more similar to that of this present paper. Anyway SOGGIN grasped all-too-correctly from the oral presentation my view that the "presence" of J-E-Dtr strands is more "provable" than "which is which". — My Geneva paper was reported more noncommittally in H. J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (Gütersloh 1973) 308.

⁽⁹⁾ P. DHORME's *Livres de Samuel* (Paris 1910) 167, attributes chapter 17 to E for traits said to be indicated in the commentary, but rather presumed there. He finds 16,14-23 to be in the pure style of J, and extends to J also (but with misgivings) the preceding verses of chapter 16.

sible purely human motivations and facts, the sort of thing that happens around us all the time even today. Our question is only this rather pedestrian one: Is there just as much reason for finding a D as a J or E strand in the account of David's rise?

The theory that J and E strands run through Samuel may be qualified by the sufficiently unflattering term "classic". It is found already in Kittel in 1892⁽¹⁰⁾. It was worked out in commentaries of Budde, Duhm, and Baentsch at the beginning of this century⁽¹¹⁾. The pathfinding Catholic exegete Goettsberger already in 1917 held that the "fall of Saul" narrative is plausibly explained by a double (or plural) source⁽¹²⁾. But more recent support can now be noted.

Auerbach in 1932 tried to draw from the Samuel-complex a proof that the Yahwist is to be identified with the person of Abiathar, Zadok's prey⁽¹³⁾. Hölscher in 1934 traced J down through 1 Kgs 12, and E as far as 2 Kgs 25; his allotting of 1 Sam 17 to E gives backhand confirmation to my contention that there are here three divergent outlooks, of which the classic J and E account for only two⁽¹⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁰⁾ R. KITTEL, *Die pentateuchischen Urkunden in den Büchern der Richter und Samuel* (Berlin 1892) 44-71.

⁽¹¹⁾ K. BUDDE, *Geschichte der althebräischen Literatur* (1906) 38, allots 16,14-23 to J and stresses David as warrior rather than musician; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHC 11; Tübingen 1901) 3; B. BAENTSCH, *David und sein Zeitalter* (Leipzig 1906) 36, adding that Saul's real motive for bringing a Judean warrior to his court was political, rather than therapeutic as the narrative so skilfully insinuates.

⁽¹²⁾ J. GOETTSBERGER, "Die Verwerfung des Saul", *Festgabe A. Knöpfler* (Freiburg/B 1917) 140-158; p. 155 adds that the double source is too simple to explain such subvariants as 13,7 versus 15,13.

⁽¹³⁾ 2 Kgs 2,35; garbled genealogy in 2 Sam 8,17; E. AUERBACH, *Wüste und Gelobtes Land* (Berlin 1932) pp. 29 and 291. On p. 196 it is asserted that there are three rather than two narratives about the first meeting of David with Saul: 1 Sam 16,14-23; 17,31; and 17,55-58. From Auerbach's "J=Abiathar" [R. CORNEY, *IDB* (1962) 1,7], a further inference has been drawn that E is Zadok: I. HYLANDER, *Der literarische Samuel-Saul-Komplex (1. Sam. 1-15) traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (Uppsala 1932). His lengthy note on p. 193 "declining" to analyze the sources on David's rise, in fact asserts that the choice of David by Samuel (1 Sam 16,1-13) is the late invention of some editor of the traditions, whether borrowed from E or transformed from the Agag scene to serve as leadover to the anointing.

⁽¹⁴⁾ G. HÖLSCHER, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Sit-

Who has ever noticed that de Vaux's commentary on Samuel quietly supports the classic J and E strands running through it⁽¹⁵⁾? On our specific problem he notes that the Samuel narrative gives *two* versions of David's rise: one presumably being the "prophetic tradition" to which he allots 1 Sam 16,1-13; the other at least partly in 17,1-31, because he mingles *both* in 17,32-53. His published statements do not exclude that for him the Goliath story should be due to J (17,1-31; and JE, verses 32-53). He would also have to admit that the Redactor (Noth's Deuteronomist), must have inserted such passages as are incompatible with the flanking J and E material (though de Vaux does not in any explicit way support my claim that 16,14-23 as such is a Dtr insertion).

4. Support Continuing since the Sixties

Stinespring sharply severs 16,14-23 from what he calls the "Late Source" responsible for 16,1-13; and he admits as a possibility that chapter 17 may belong to the "Late Source"⁽¹⁶⁾. Blenkinsopp's study of chapter 14 considers "most propitious" the relating of some Samuel elements to J or E in a broad unsystematic way, and proposes to seek out in the Samuel books certain "J-patterns"⁽¹⁷⁾.

Eissfeldt's almost-canonical source-dissection (1964 revision) firmly allots to E the narrative of 16,1-13 as I do, but unluckily for me (or for him) he yields the rest of the chapter to the same E narrator, and also the verses 32-39 of chapter 17⁽¹⁸⁾. The researches of de Boer also in their way confirm and promote the validity of J and E strands in Samuel⁽¹⁹⁾. Hertzberg in 1960 admitted that the con-

zungsbericht 42/3, Heidelberg 1942) 29 (allotting ch. 17 to E and 16,14-23 to J).

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Jerusalem Bible, Samuel* (Paris 1961).

⁽¹⁶⁾ W. F. STINESPRING, "Samuel", in H. MAY, *Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York 1962) 330.

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. BLENKINSOPP, "Jonathan's Sacrilege, 1 Sm 14,1-46: a Study in Literary History", *CBQ* 26 (1964) 445f.

⁽¹⁸⁾ O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen³ 1964) 363 [*The Old Testament, An Introduction*, tr. P. Ackroyd (Oxford³ 1965) 274; cf. p. 273: "If, at least in I Samuel, an E sequence may be demonstrated almost without gaps, there automatically becomes probable the existence also of an older sequence"].

⁽¹⁹⁾ P. DE BOER, "I Samuel XVII: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (1942) 87 says that 1 Sam 17,15 is not a rational way of

tinuation of J and E in Samuel, though then "ever less favored", is of most immediate pertinence to the Samuel-Saul relation.

The picture of Saul [even in David's own mind] fluctuates in the tradition between admiration-veneration and repugnance-fear... The basic friendliness to Saul [of an earlier stage] has not been edited out, but overlaid by a quite other stance. — ... The Goliath story negates ch. 16, in fact both halves of it⁽²⁰⁾.

Hertzberg goes on to demand a whole new basis of dissection: a Mizpah tradition showing David as destined to be king; a counter-tradition in Gilgal knowing him as victim of Saul's persecution.

In the 1965 reprint of Rost's classic essay on another Pretender's rise in David's later career, the general J-E division of Samuel is still casually supported⁽²¹⁾. Thus we must take with a grain of salt the brand-new comment of McCarter: "Rost initiated a movement away from the attempt to isolate parallel strands⁽²²⁾". Weiser's 1965 essay on David's Rise agrees with Wellhausen that 1 Sam 16,1-13 is a later addition [... ergo likelier E than J] and hardly historical, even though essential to the *overall* course of events⁽²³⁾.

Hauer recognizes in *Saul's* rise (which we deal with below) two "sources", promonarchic and deuteronomistic: behind which however lie *three* "stories, however they may be parceled out among the sources [L — J — E as Eissfeldt]" — or even *four*, reflecting successive extensions of Saul's rule⁽²⁴⁾.

bringing in David, but it is erroneous to suppose that the original text must have been rational: as shown by J. PEDERSEN, *Israel* (London 1940) 3, 51. — DE BOER's *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel 1-16* (Amsterdam 1938) gives no indication of why he stopped precisely between chapters 16 and 17.

⁽²⁰⁾ H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelisbücher* (ATD, Göttingen² 1960) 10; 117 [my translation; cf. *I & II Samuel: a Commentary* (Philadelphia 1965) 198].

⁽²¹⁾ L. ROST, "Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids" [BWANT 3/6, Stuttgart 1936] in *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg 1965) 119, 191, 233.

⁽²²⁾ P. K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City 1980) 27. His article on David's Rise (1 Sam 16-2 Sam 5) is entitled "Apology of David": *JBL* 99 (1980) 189-204.

⁽²³⁾ A. WEISER, "Die Legitimation des Königs David: zur Eigenart und Entstehung der sogenannten Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg", *VT* 16 (1966) 326.

⁽²⁴⁾ C. E. HAUER, "Does 1 Samuel 9,1-11,15 Reflect the Extension of Saul's Dominions?", *JBL* 86 (1967) 306-310.

Under the exciting title "The Younger Generation in the OT", Joachim Conrad's essay finds in the Goliath story, and specifically the part missing in the Greek, the *earliest* narrative about David's rise⁽²⁵⁾. That would plausibly mean J. The *youth*-aspect of David's is indeed prominent in all three accounts, but the *hero*-aspect is made responsible for early origin. Really his book aims only to prove that most OT heroes *became* such at an early age, even if we know them chiefly as "patriarchs".

5. Respectful Attention to J-E Opponents

Throughout the earlier parts of this century, most of the views directly opposed to J-E strands in Samuel seem to be from Jewish experts. Martin Buber repeatedly claimed that nothing in our Bible really warrants the charge that behind it can be discerned sources combined inconsistently and repetitiously⁽²⁶⁾. A kindred view would be expected from Kaufmann.

More proximately, Morgenstern worked out a view that the emergence of David was due to the non-existence of any principle of dynastic heredity at that early date; the Son-in-Law was just as good a candidate as any for the inheriting of regal power⁽²⁷⁾. Nearer still to our subject is an essay of Segal claiming that the Goliath account in chapter 17 is the older and more reliably correct view of David's rise, despite modern scholars' virtual unanimity to the contrary⁽²⁸⁾.

Rolf Rendtorff still in 1971 was maintaining that unlike the planned unity of the narrative of succession *to* David (Rost), the story of David's *Rise* contains "several traditions loosely juxtaposed", and gets its unity only from the insertions of the compiler⁽²⁹⁾. The

(25) J. CONRAD, *Die junge Generation im AT* (Stuttgart 1970, from Leipzig dissertation 1963) 64. His "Davids Aufstieg", *TLZ* 97 (1972) 324, finds a *Sitz im Leben* in Solomon's need to legitimate the Davidic line during the Jeroboam crisis.

(26) M. BUBER, "Die Erzählung von Sauls Königswahl", *VT* 6 (1956) 113 (-173).

(27) J. MORGENSTERN, "David and Jonathan", *JBL* 78 (1959) 322, noting that in Gen 36,31-39 = 1 Chr 1,43-51, not one of the eight kings of Edom was succeeded by his son.

(28) M. H. SEGAL, "The Composition of the Books of Samuel", *JQR* 55 (1965) 336.

(29) R. RENDTORFF, "Beobachtungen zur altisraelitischen Geschichtsschreibung anhand der Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids", *Festschrift G. VON RAD, Probleme biblischer Theologie*, [ed. W. WOLFF] (München 1971) 432, 436.

attack which Rendtorff later mounted on J's very existence leaves intact much of the *principle* of doublet-dissection⁽³⁰⁾.

In short, continued emergence of anti-JE views from time to time deserves respect. But so far it has served chiefly to illustrate the essential agreement among Christian and even Jewish scholars that the basic norms and strands of source-dissection are valid and will endure.

6. Parallel «Three-Variant Account» of Saul's Own Rise

Saul's own rise into prominence has also, though more recently and doubtless dependently, been found to contain three separate versions (or two or four) very much parallel to the ones we have noted for David. Parallel, that is, only in *content* and in subjection to deuteronomist editing; not by any eventual nexus with J or E.

Volkmar Fritz, apparently enjoying the approval of G. Wallis, A. Weiser, and H. Wildberger, sifts out these unities: In 1 Sam 9,1 — 10,16, Saul's rise is due to his anointing by Samuel; then in 10,17-27 he is chosen by *lot* at Mizpah; finally in 11,1-15 he is *elected* at Gilgal; Fritz considers these as merely three *literary* doublets of the same event, three non-historical efforts to legitimize kingship⁽³¹⁾.

The three unities noted by Birch are quite different: 1 Sam 10,10-13 is a proverb; the search for the donkeys (9,1 — 10,16) is an old folk-tale "usually assigned to the so-called Early Source"; while into it a later editor inserted the story of Saul's anointing⁽³²⁾. Miller's triad is interesting in that it excludes Samuel from original role in any of the three: *a*) the old folk-tale about *Saul* and the donkeys, using the toponym *Gibeah*; *b*) a variant of the same account using *Geba* and making Jonathan the hero at Michmash; *c*) Saul (whether

⁽³⁰⁾ R. RENDTORFF, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuchs* (BZAW 147; Berlin 1977); my analysis, "Can Geography Save J from Rendtorff?", *Bib* 63 (1982) 47-55.

⁽³¹⁾ V. FRITZ, "Die Deutungen des Königtums Sauls in den Überlieferungen von seiner Entstehung 1 Sam 9-11", *ZAW* 88 (1976) 346; see also M. Bič, "Saul sucht die Eselinnen", *VT* 7 (1957) 92-97.

⁽³²⁾ B. C. BIRCH, "The Development of the Tradition of the Anointing of Saul in 1 Sam 9:1 — 10:16", *JBL* 90 (1971) 55-68; in his 1970 Yale dissertation, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of 1 Sam 7-15* (SBL diss. 27; Missoula 1976) 3, he says, "The identification of the early and late sources with J and E now receives very little support".

he was already crowned or not being left dubious) with an army from *Gibeah* delivers Jabesh-Gilead from Ammonites⁽³³⁾.

An earlier analysis by Seebass held only two sources: a) "the real facts"; and b) "the narrative dominated by Samuel": this outlook will be recognized as identical with mine in dividing chapter 16⁽³⁴⁾. Two sources of the Seebass type seem to be reckoned with by McCarthy, but he calls them "a pro-Saul cycle and a Samuel cycle", both told to promote political aims; and instead of a "protodeuteronomistic working of the sources" he proposes "the deuteronomist used materials from a Samuel-cycle to construct his reinterpretation of things⁽³⁵⁾".

Just as there are four separate David's-Rise accounts if you give the Greek variants special prominence (fn. 63 below), so also McKenzie approaches Saul's Rise under the title "The Four Samuels". He denies that Samuel ever ended up really a magistrate type of judge [my term for 1 Sam 7,16 is "have gavel, will travel"]; but he was a Seer as distinct from Prophet, and the other two Samuels are apparently the Pro- and Anti-Monarchist⁽³⁶⁾. Tsevat finds the real rift between Samuel and Saul neither in antimonarchianism nor in personal animosities but in divergence between the "old, 'sacral'" and the new-secular policies of waging war⁽³⁷⁾. *No sources at all* are admitted by Smelik; he firmly defends the compositional unity of the Saul's-rise story; Saul is just a foil for David, "the *wrong* way to

⁽³³⁾ J. M. MILLER, "Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning 1 Sam 9:1 — 10:16; 10:26 — 11:15 and 13:2 — 14:46", *CBQ* 36 (1974) 157-174.

⁽³⁴⁾ H. SEEBASS, "Traditionsgeschichte von 1 Sam 8; 10; 17ff; und 12", *ZAW* 77 (1965) 286-296 [and cognate 78 (1966) 148-179; 79 (1967) 155-171]; now his *David, Saul und das Wesen des biblischen Glaubens* (Neukirchen 1980) ends on p. 134: "The great and still very hypothetical work of the Yahwist introduced insights on Israel's role among the nations, which drew conclusions from the historical experiences of the kings Saul and David".

⁽³⁵⁾ D. J. MCCARTHY, "The Inauguration of Monarchy in Israel: a Form-Critical Study of 1 Samuel 1-12", *Interpretation* 27 (1973) 405; but see the revised stand in his re-edited *Treaty and Covenant* (AnBib 21A; Rome 1978) 206-221.

⁽³⁶⁾ J. L. MCKENZIE, "The Four Samuels", *BR* 7 (1962) 15.

⁽³⁷⁾ M. TSEVAT, "The Emergence of the Israelite Monarchy: Eli, Samuel and Saul", in A. MALAMAT *et al.* ed., *World History of the Jewish People* [IV/1] II/2, *Age of the Monarchies: Culture and Society* (Jerusalem 1979) 1,72; my review in *Bib* 63 (1982) 280.

be king"; but the Bible affords no proof that he had a real conflict with Samuel⁽³⁸⁾. Other defenders of compositional unity have tended to be tacit or oblique. Gunn contents himself with fleeting jabs at "everybody's tortured analysis" (of 13,8 vs.10,8; again 15,20)⁽³⁹⁾. Clements eliminates not only source-variants but even conflict-buildup by his claim (invoking Martin Noth) that Samuel's opposition was never against 'kingship itself' but against 'a king not chosen by YHWH' [though Samuel's activity seems no less YHWH-guided in seeking Saul than in seeking David]; and Clements disallows also any interplay of "charismatic versus non-charismatic"⁽⁴⁰⁾. Vannoy's contribution is called by Birch 'unconvincingly conservative'⁽⁴¹⁾. Martin-Achard seems aloof from the source question⁽⁴²⁾. And this is a rarity⁽⁴³⁾.

From this brief survey we must ruefully acknowledge total absence of any openness toward J or E as explanatory factor in doublets or variant sources vigorously maintained to exist. On the other hand, there is a more active role assigned to Dtr, as we will now take up in returning to the somewhat-parallel three-source variant of David's rise.

7. Lip-service but no job for the Deuteronomist

We here focus the curious fact that no one has ever attributed to the Deuteronomist redactor the parts of chapters 16 and 17 admitted *not to fit* the portions allotted almost universally to a two-or-threelfold tradition whether akin to J/E or not. Caspari had in

⁽³⁸⁾ K. A. D. SMELIK, *Saul. De voorstelling van Israëls eerste koning in de Masoretische tekst van het Oude T.* (Amsterdam dissertation 1977); see ZAW 90 (1978) 149.

⁽³⁹⁾ D. M. GUNN, *The Fate of King Saul: an Interpretation of a Biblical Story* (JSOT Sup. 14; Sheffield 1980) 29.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ R. E. CLEMENTS, "The Deuteronomistic Interpretation of the Founding of the Monarchy in 1 Sam VIII", *VT* 24 (1974) 398-410.

⁽⁴¹⁾ J. R. VANNOY, *Covenant Renewal at Gilgal: a Study of 1 Sam 11:14 – 12:25* (Cherry Hill NJ 1978); BIRCH in *CBQ* 41 (1979) 637.

⁽⁴²⁾ R. MARTIN-ACHARD, "L'institution de la royauté en Israël. Quelques remarques sur 1 Sam 8", *Bulletin du Centre Protestant d'Études* 29,3 (1977) 45-50.

⁽⁴³⁾ G. VON RAD, "Zwei Überlieferungen vom König Saul", first published in *Gesammelte Studien* 2, ed. R. SMEND (TBü 48; München 1973) 199-211, deals with 1 Sam 13f only as a foil to the style of 1 Sam 24; 26.

fact attributed to D not the second but the first part of chapter 16, because he considered that the second half was a "novelist's invention" — precisely the portion which we consider to be most historically substantiated⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Martin Noth, to whom all modern exegesis is heavily indebted for its recognition that Samuel is part of an integral Deuteronomist history, himself seems to allot to D nothing of our chapters 16 or 17, and indeed only brief patches of any neighboring chapter⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Carlson calls 1 Sam 16,1-3 "typically Deuteronomic terminology"; and yet after noting the fluctuation of experts in their dating of passages assigned to J or E, Carlson insists that the group-author called D was not as blindly faithful to its sources as is maintained by Noth and Christopher North; rather the D-group made pioneering use of an esteemed ideal figure to give expression to their own (Zadokite) faith⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Schunck's almost-simultaneous research explicitly asserts that the Deuteronomist added nothing to chapters 16 or 17. However, Schunck's conclusion that a separate tradition begins with verse 14 of chapter 16 does tend to support my proposal. He moreover attributes this to a Redactor, distinct from the two main strands which he calls the Jabesh and the Gilead traditions⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Thereby we are brought into the cult-drama analysis of the origins of the biblical sagas, which certainly sounds more fresh and interesting than the old stuff about J and E. So we may now give heed to similarly in-views.

8. Does cult-amphictyony origin dispense from JE?

In several researches of Stoebe the claim is advanced that classic theories put the doublets all in the wrong places⁽⁴⁸⁾. Akin to this is

⁽⁴⁴⁾ W. CASPARI, *Die Samuelbücher* (KAT 8; Leipzig 1926) 14 (attributing to E most of the Goliath-saga in 1 Sam 17).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* I (Halle 1943) 61; 95; see comment of K. KOCH, *RGG*³ 5, 1359.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ R. CARLSON, *David the Chosen King. A Tradition-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel* (Uppsala 1964) 158; p. 17 on C. NORTH, *ZAW* 50 (1932) 8-32 and *OT Interpretation of History* (London 1946) 99.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ K.-D. SCHUNCK, *Benjamin: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Geschichte eines israelitischen Stammes* (BZAW 86; Berlin 1963) 107.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ H.-J. STOEBE, 'Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. xvii, 1 — xviii, 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta', *VT* 6 (1956) 399; 405 [4 (1954) 177-184]; "David

Hertzberg's above-noted demand for a whole new basis of dissection. He proposes that the Mizpah tradition knew David as destined to the king, while a counter-tradition at Gilgal knew him as the victim of Saul's persecution⁽⁴⁹⁾. I find somewhat similar the cult-drama position inspired by von Rad and taken up by Beyerlin.

The cult-drama origin of the specifically "Exodus" event [pasover] was related by von Rad to the Feast of Weeks at Gilgal, where the "small historical Credo" of Dt 26,5; \cong 6,20 was also involved. By contrast, he locates the cult-drama of the Joshua-Takeover at Shechem⁽⁵⁰⁾. To this Martin Noth added that the Sinai theophany was a *third* separate cult-drama experience; and that the three "remembrances" were of three separate groups whose "salvation-experiences" had been independent of one another⁽⁵¹⁾. Kraus preferred to associate the Takeover-liturgy with Gilgal, and the Sinai-theophany first with Shechem but eventually Jerusalem⁽⁵²⁾.

But Beyerlin's thorough study of the data used by these pioneers comes to the altogether tenable conclusion that three such cult-dramas, though autonomous as a local annual festival, could quite well preserve merely an exclusive focus on one *aspect* of a single continuous occurrence *shared* somehow by the forebears of the three groups⁽⁵³⁾. This work of Beyerlin's is a good example of how concordist exegesis need not be always or *a priori* wrong.

und Mikal: Überlegungen zur Jugendgeschichte Davids", Festschrift for O. EISSFELDT, *Von Ugarit nach Qumran* (BZAW 77; Berlin 1958) 243 n. 168; "Gedanken zur Heldensage in den Samuelbüchern", Festschrift for L. ROST, *Das ferne und nahe Wort* (BZAW 105; Berlin 1967) 208-218.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ HERTZBERG in fn. 20 above.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ G. VON RAD, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs* (BWANT 78; Stuttgart 1938; = *Gesammelte Studien* I; TBü 8 [1958] 9-86).

⁽⁵¹⁾ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs* (Stuttgart 1948) 48.

⁽⁵²⁾ H.-J. KRAUS, "Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels", *VT* 1 (1951) 193.

⁽⁵³⁾ W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinai-traditionen* (Tübingen 1961) = *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinai Traditions*, tr. S. Rudman (Oxford 1965). — W. BEYERLIN in "Das Königscharisma bei Saul", *ZAW* 73 (1961) 186, opposed the view of A. ALT, "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina" (1930 = *Kleine Schriften* II, 1-65), that Saul's kingship was only a provisional step toward David's; see further G. BUCCEL-

These authors, even Noth, do not lay as much emphasis on the *amphictyony*-shrine for habitat of the cult-drama as I would expect. Nor do they link either the cult-drama or the *amphictyony* shrine with strands like J or E. But we do have good reason for looking upon Jerusalem as the center of the cult-drama of P, in which I would somehow prefer to see the Passover event, the main annual pilgrimage. The cult-drama of the Takeover or Jordan-crossing may well be linked with the *amphictyony*-center Shiloh, near which was not only Shechem but also *its* Gilgal (all northern shrines, therefore E; there were *two* traditions of the Gilgal-crossing, one at Jericho and one nearer to Shechem and *both* are preserved in Jerome and in the Madaba Map). As for the third cult-drama, the Sinai theophany, differing perhaps too audaciously from the above pioneers, I would tend to locate it in the *southern* *amphictyony* [J!]: either at Hebron, Gerar, or Beersheba (all sacral) or quite possibly at Cadesbarnea itself, where (at least according to some of the evidences) it really took place. Noth's book on the *amphictyony* insists that the *shrine* itself, though utterly central to the very notion of "amphi"-*ktiony*, need not have remained always in the same place⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Noth also never maintained a *single* *amphictyony* of all Israel, but rather a six-tribe alliance in North and South respectively, excluding Jerusalem-Jebus until David seized this to be his "extraterritorial capital"⁽⁵⁵⁾. Rejection of Noth's *amphictyony*, as a "Greek-mentality importation" is now almost universal, usually based on misunderstanding of the points just mentioned⁽⁵⁶⁾. But I firmly

LATI, "Da Saul a David", *Bibbia e Oriente* 1 (1959) 99-128; and A. KAPELRUD, "König David und die Söhne des Saul", *ZAW* 67 (1955) 198-205.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ M. NOTH, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT 52; Stuttgart 1930 = 1966) 79, 96; on the pair of *six* tribes, p. 75, 85.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ M. NOTH, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition", *OTS* 8 (1951) 28-46; A. ALT, "Jerusalems Aufstieg", *ZDMG* 79 (1925) 119.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ R. DE VAUX, "La thèse de l'amphictyonie israélite", *HTR* 64 (P. Lapp memorial 1971) 415-436, as already in a footnote supporting W. H. IRWIN, "Le sanctuaire central israélite avant l'établissement de la monarchie", *RB* 72 (1965) 161-184; further G. FOHRER, "Altes Testament — 'Amphictyonie' und 'Bund'?", *TLZ* 91 (1966) 801-816, 893-904; H. J. ORLINSKY, "The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups in the Period of the Judges", *Studies and Essays for A. Newman* (Leiden 1962) 375-387; C. H. J. DE GEUS, *The Tribes of Israel: an Investigation into some of the Pre-*

continue to hold that it is a plausible working-hypothesis, to be developed and improved, especially in establishing the cult-drama origin not only of the Exodus but of virtually the whole Bible; and also in relating to these cult-centers the strands called J, E, P, and D.

The first king was a military amphictyony-general, according to Wildberger; but from this he draws the rather baffling conclusion, "hence the charismatic element in the founding of kingship does not have the importance claimed by Alt" (⁵⁷). The very foundation-stone of Noth's Amphictyony is precisely the *charismatic* character of the Judges' activity featured earlier by Weber (⁵⁸).

Amsler's volume rejects Rost's "geographical opposition" between a Northern and a Southern amphictyony (⁵⁹). I frankly with Noth and Alt find the "antagonistic North/South 'spheres of influence'" to be a most illuminating key to the whole of Israelite history both as regards event and as regards literary formulation (J, southern Judah; P, Jerusalem traditions; E, Ephraim, the North). Amsler also rejects Gunneweg's "political" theory pointing to an opposition between amphictyony and state.

We must note in passing the half-dozen titles which would seem to offer something for or against amphictyony-linked sources but do not (⁶⁰).

suppositions of M. Noth's Amphictyony Hypothesis (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 18; Assen 1976) ["demolishes Noth, but with some dubious theories and methods", says G. AHLSTRÖM in *JNES* 39 (1980) 322-325]. Noth's amphictyony is redimensioned with the help of Christian SIGRIST's African "segmentary society" in F. CRÜSEMAN, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum: die antiköniglichen Texte des ATs und der Kampf um den frühen israelitischen Staat* (WMANT 49; Neukirchen 1978) 201.

(⁵⁷) H. WILDBERGER, "Samuel und die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums", *TZ* 13 (W. Baumgartner issue, 1957) 442-469. [Not to be confused with F. MILDENBERGER, whose 1962 Tübingen dissertation, *Die vordeuteronomistische Saul-Davidüberlieferung*, held that an earlier account was later revised in prophetic circles].

(⁵⁸) M. WEBER, *Ancient Judaism [Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen 3, 1921]*, tr. H. Gerth, D. Martindale (Glencoe 1952).

(⁵⁹) S. AMSLER, *David roi et messie* (Neuchâtel 1963) 14; L. ROST, "Sinai-bund und Davidsbund", *TLZ* 72 (1947) 129-134; A. GUNNEWEG, "Sinai-bund und Davidsbund", *VT* 10 (1960) 335-341; J. L. LEUBA, "Le dualisme Israël-Juda", *Verbum Caro* (1947) 172ff.

(⁶⁰) A. LODS, "Les sources des récits du 1^{er} livre de Samuel", *Études de*

Noth's Amphictyony is not so intrinsically linked to his Deuteronomist that the one hypothesis must necessarily go down the drain with the other. But here too the nature of Noth's Deuteronomist has been misunderstood. His "deuteronomist" was *not* the author of Deuteronomy itself (chapters 5-30, the real "D" and part of the *Pentateuch*), but only of the outer framework (chapters 1-4, 31-34) binding it into a unity with all the following books Joshua-Judges through Samuel-Kings⁽⁶¹⁾. (For Deuteronomist Noth and all others use his abbreviation *Dtr.*, but I prefer *Drt.*, which cannot be confused with Deuteronomy because in it the letters do not occur in that order). Though to Noth's Deuteronomist is assigned no relation with J and E in those later books, his widely-respected analysis does not exclude them and in fact presumes them intact for the *Pentateuch* (including Deuteronomy as far as it is relevant, and possibly Joshua).

9. Latter-day allies, Nübel to Gordon

Finally we turn to a wholly original research on our subject by Nübel. He bases entirely on chapters 16 and 17 the distinction between an earthy *Grundschrift* and a *Bearbeitung* stressing God's wondrous power⁽⁶²⁾. The term "David's Rise" in his title is expanded by him to include five "moments", of which only the first fits our understanding of David's *emergence*, namely his being directed to the court of Saul. In all five steps, and chiefly in chapters 16f, Nübel claims to see only *two* layers, although there are *three* lines traced by him, of which two came from before the Redactor and the third was the Redactor's own.

Théologie et d'Histoire (Montauban Anniversary; Paris 1901) 257-284, distinguishing a "seer-source" and a "Jabesh-source"; H. TIKTIN, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern Samuelis* (FRLANT 16; Göttingen 1922); R. PRESS, "Der Prophet Samuel: eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung", *ZAW* 56 (1938) 210; T. C. VRIEZEN, "De compositie van de Samuël-Boeken", *Orientalia Neerlandica* anniversary volume (Leiden 1948) 167-189; G. WALLIS, "Die Anfänge des Königtums in Israel", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Halle* 12 (1963) 239-247.

⁽⁶¹⁾ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle² 1957 = 1943) 1, 40.

⁽⁶²⁾ H.-U. NÜBEL, *David's Aufstieg in der Frühe israelitischer Geschichtsschreibung* (Bonn dissertation 1959) 26.

A few pages later, however, Nübel is seen to postulate a "re-working", which ends up as really a *third account* rather than a mere harmonizing. Search of Saul's courtiers for a therapist is put as "part" of the narrative about Samuel anointing a son of Jesse; and yet Nübel raises the question of whether the second half of chapter 16 could be independent. Moreover in a much later stage, after careful vocabulary statistics, Nübel holds that David *first* became conspicuous in Saul's service, but only *later* was anointed and favored by Samuel as one in a series of Saul's opponents. The original Grundschrift, whose suggested title was "YHWH and David" is not seen to be adequately explained as a defense of David against charges of haste and ambition; it stressed rather YHWH's help. Then why did the Re-Worker write at all? In order to express the fact that *contrition* was needed as well as obedience⁽⁶³⁾.

With Nübel, Knierim holds that 1 Sam 17 is conflated from an older and a newer version, [just as] also 16,1-13 is more recent than 16,14-23⁽⁶⁴⁾. Very much in Nübel's research supports the good old view that we have one strand (the third) from an earthy humanist, another (the first) from a theologizing re-appraiser, plus inconsistent elements stemming rather from the hard facts of the case.

Concurrently with Nübel appeared an American dissertation on David's Rise by Ward⁽⁶⁵⁾. Both are attacked by Grønbaek for limiting themselves to literary analysis while claiming to advance into "tradition-history"⁽⁶⁶⁾. Grønbaek finds in 1 Sam 17 alone two

(63) NÜBEL, *David's Aufstieg* p. 148. On p. 87 it is asserted that the *Grundschrift* is always concerned with "the man David"; the *Bearbeiter* always with "the people of God". On p. 17 is rejected WELLHAUSEN's undue reliance on the Septuagint variants. On this problem should be noted also: H. S. GEHMAN, "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of 1 Samuel", *JAOS* 70 (1950) 292-296; B. JOHNSON, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches des Septuaginta* (1963); Simon J. DeVRIES, "David's Victory over the Philistine as Saga and as Legend", *JBL* 92 (1973) 23-36; J. MAUCLINE, *1-2 Samuel* (New Century Bible; London 1971) 24.

(64) R. KNIERIM, "The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel" [= *EvTh* 30 (1970) 113-133], *Festschrift* for E. C. COLWELL, *Jesus and the Historian*, ed. F. TROTTER (Philadelphia 1968) 21.

(65) R. L. WARD, *The Story of David's Rise: a traditio-historical study of I Samuel XVI,14 — II Samuel V* (Nashville 1967).

(66) J. H. GRØNBAEK, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (1. Sam. 15 — 2. Sam. 5)*, tr. H. Leisterer (*Acta Theologica Danica* 10; Copenhagen 1971) 14-18.

strands (a battle-motif incompatible with a duel-motif), though that chapter as a whole *combines* with 16,14-23 to give us two traditions of how David came into the court.

Like all these recent authors, in focusing the *real facts of the case* as separable from literary-construct motivations, we are focusing the *sociological* situation: which however now appears more prominently in Schicklberger with special attention to the relation between community and individual in the early kings' era⁽⁶⁷⁾. Kessler in apparent resistance to critics' later dating of 1 Sam 16,1-13 "readily grants that the pericope is tendentious"⁽⁶⁸⁾. Willis holds plainly that 16,14-23 was inserted by the *final redactor*, though as part of a *rejection* of Saul, not therapy for him⁽⁶⁹⁾. Other recent formulas, while vaguer, are not unfavorable to my stance⁽⁷⁰⁾.

In 1978 appeared from the Danish a corroboration better than I could have hoped, for exactly what I find to be the three narratives' *content*-contribution of source-evaluation: "Many scholars think that [1 Sam 16,14-23] contains the most valuable historical information; ... 1 Sam 16,1-13 is legendary and secondary; 'David's Rise' could exist without 16,1-13; but 16 [14-23] is indispensable⁽⁷¹⁾".

Gordon too in 1980 put the three-source case as helpfully as I could wish:

"David's Rise" does not represent the same homogeneous blending of sources as is the case with the Narrative of Suc-

(67) F. SCHICKLBERGER, "Die Davididen und das Nordreich. Beobachtungen zur sog. Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids", *BZ* 18 (1974) 255-263; and his Graz dissertation, *Die David-Überlieferung von 1. 2. Sam; 1. Kön 1-2 mit besonderem Blick auf das Verhältnis von Gemeinschaft und Einzelnem in der frühen Königszeit untersucht* [*BZ* 23 (1979) 156].

(68) M. KESSLER, "Narrative Technique in 1 Sam 16: 1-13", *CBQ* 32 (1970) 552; citing 30 (1968) 220-225, Hittite analogue by H. HOFFNER.

(69) J. T. WILLIS, "The Function of Comprehensive Anticipatory Redactional Joins in 1 Samuel 16-18", *ZAW* 85 (1973) 299.

(70) J. R. ROSENBLOOM, "Social Science Concepts of Modernization and Biblical History: the Development of the Israelite Monarchy", *JAAR* 40 (1972) 437-444: "several literary strata including numerous traditions precluding any agreeable reconstruction". — T. N. D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah, the Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBib OT; Lund 1976); the long review by J.-M. DE TARRAGON, *RB* 87 (1980) 293-298, warns of the complexity of the sources but shows nothing about J or E.

(71) N. P. LEMCHE, "David's Rise", *JStOT* 10 (1978) 4 = "Davids vej til tronen", *DanskTT* 38 (1975) 243.

cession ... At some point the [? two, as Grønbaek] traditions relating to David's early career [were united by a] 'narrator', however we envisage his role⁽⁷²⁾.

It may perhaps seem ill-advised to put forward this triple source without linking it more insistently with style-characteristics. Blenkinsopp (fn. 17 above) has been criticized for combining motif with style in source-analysis. But I think he is right in this: an evaluator must *first* form a judgment on the suitability of *content* to what J, E, and D are known to prefer, before proceeding to the more minute and superficial style-characteristics as corroboration.

10. Conclusions

Here then is a summary of my proposals in order of the firmness of the evidence.

1) There are certainly three different narratives of how David rose to power, not incompatible with one another but not even juxtaposed with any editorial effort to interrelate them.

2) Almost every expert, recent and earlier, recognizes at least two, or sometimes four, of these juxtaposed variants, and tries to account for them either with or against the continuance of J/E strands, but never crediting any specific content to the Deuteronomist.

3) Apart from more technical vocabulary statistics (most of which date from the 1890s and have to be fully re-done for the whole Octateuch in any case), the epic story of David's killing Goliath (existing in at least two other narrations about a Bethlehemite named Elhanan killing a giant of Gath), has chiefly the traits which we would associate with J. The setting is in the South, a rustic area of Judah. There are interesting concrete details: the brothers' lunch-pail, a cookie for their boss; the five flat stones, the cumbrous armor. God's role in the recital is limited to his mention in David's vaunt of confidence.

4) The anointing by (the Northerner!) Samuel, exactly in the spirit of the Elohist narrator, tries to attribute every effect to God by secondary causality. [Eissfeldt finds *both* J and E (but not his cherished L) in *both* chapters]. The whole blame for forcing a change of

⁽⁷²⁾ R. P. GORDON, "David's Rise and Saul's Demise: Narrative Analogy in 1 Samuel 24-26" (Tyndale OT Lecture 1979), *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980) 38, 42.

dynasty at all falls not on Samuel but on God's inner whisperings. Rejection of the six (or seven) bigger brothers, and suspicion that there must be another, shows Samuel motivated by confidence in an information not related to experience, and not unlike the "Angel" in Pentateuch-E.

5) It is virtually universal to acknowledge a deuteronomist who drew into unity several utterly unrelated documents (Judges, Joshua...), and, to link them, creatively originated a deuteronomy-frame. It is inconsistent with this admission, and uneconomical too, to leave this Deuteronomist without any specific content-insertions in the later story. Specifically we would expect from him the "latest views", the "sifted facts" debunked after some centuries of rhapsodists' campfire narratives.

6) Though there is no denying the realism of Samuel's sudden hatred of Saul and capricious criticism of him, and though there is great historical likelihood of some youthful exploit of David's which helped both the beleaguered Judeans and David's own budding career: still by far the most convincingly human and likely of the three motivations is the need of finding a therapist for Saul in his advancing insanity. The qualities attributed to David are perfect for that. He is acceptable (1 Sam 16,21) because he is attractive and very young, "a pink-cheeked babyface" in the curious epithet repeated both in 16,12 and 17,42. He has learned to play the guitar and can soothe Saul's worst moments, even by foreseeing the course of salvation-history and his own destined role in it (as was insuperably expressed in Browning's poem a century ago). But when music failed, David was the fearless strong-armed youth who could kill lions bare-handed and giants with scarcely more equipment.

7) Thus the factual information and also the phraseology contained in 1 Sm 16,14-23 may well be attributed entirely to the Deuteronomist himself (Drt; only reductively D). Doubtless he was drawing on some different kind of document, because after all he could hardly have had reliable (even orally transmitted) personal knowledge of these events which took place as long before him as the Pilgrim Fathers are before us.

8) My firmest conclusion though, despite its appearance in last place, is that the *recognition* of these three variants and their separate *ethos* is of greater reliability and importance than their respective attribution to J, E, and D(rt). Vocabulary-statistics or other style-features unnoticed by me could relocate those three attributions

without changing the basic issue. It will have been noted that the more recent authorities probably with no cognizance of my 1965 Geneva first draft, *support* at least indirectly my J and E, whilst disagreement comes from the old-timers. JEPD is in any case and will remain purely a "working hypothesis", and any step we can take toward showing *either* its further applicability *or* its irrelevance is of value toward grasping better the *real* human authorship of the Word of God.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Robert NORTH S. J.

SOMMAIRE

L'accès de David au pouvoir est décrit avec le plus convaincant réalisme dans 1 Sam 16,14-23, vraisemblablement d'une source proche du(des) 'Deutéronomiste(s)' même(s): la famille de Saül même cherche un 'thérapeute' qui puisse restreindre ou éventuellement guérir leur chef. La geste héroïque de 1 Sam 17 correspond au caractère de 'J', y compris sa situation sud. L'onction par Samuel (du Nord comme Saül lui-même), 1 Sam 16,1-13, montre la préoccupation de la source Élohiste de faire entrer en jeu Dieu par des intermédiaires, et manque d'attaches dans la continuité de la narration. Les analyses de vocabulaire et de diction qui ont amené les pionniers à distribuer diversement les sources J et E sont en tout cas à refaire entièrement, même pour le Pentateuque.

ANIMADVERSIONES

“He Set His Face”: A Note on Luke 9,51

Not only is Luke's fondness for Septuagintal language well known⁽¹⁾, but it is becoming increasingly apparent that the evangelist Luke possessed a sophisticated knowledge of the LXX and quite possibly was himself a member of the synagogue (whether Jew, proselyte, or Gentile). A few years ago J. Jervell published a collection of essays on Luke-Acts in which he parted from current opinion (formed by Dibelius, Conzelmann, Haenchen) and attempted to develop a fresh understanding of Lukan theology⁽²⁾. Jervell concluded that Luke understood the Christian movement not as a “new” Israel, but rather as a restored and believing Israel. Luke has attempted, he believes, to deal with “the question of the identity of a church which is heir to the promises given to Israel, a church which claims to be Israel, and yet still includes uncircumcised Gentiles within its membership”⁽³⁾. This new understanding of the theology of Luke-Acts, as something more than an institutionalizing of Mark as the redaction critics have understood it, but rather as a theology that stands within the stream of first century Judaism, has been receiving recent support. J. A. Sanders has observed how Luke's theology reflects sophisticated discussion on matters of Old Testament theology and hermeneutics⁽⁴⁾ while quite recently D. L. Tiede has argued that Luke is engaged in an intra-Jewish debate regarding Jesus, the Gentile mission, and the destruction of Jerusalem⁽⁵⁾. What is important in these studies is that

(1) E.g., H. F. D. SPARKS, “The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel”, *JTS* 44 (1943) 129-138; C. H. DODD, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation’”, *JRS* 37 (1947) 47-54; P. SCHUBERT, “The Structure and Significance of Luke 24”, *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21, ed. W. ELTESTER, Berlin 1954) 165-186; C. F. EVANS, “The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel”, *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. NINEHAM, Oxford 1957) 37-53.

(2) J. JERVELL, *Luke and the People of God—A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis 1972).

(3) JERVELL, *ibidem*, 17.

(4) J. A. SANDERS, “The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable”, *Essays in Old Testament Ethics* (Ed. J. L. CRENSHAW and J. T. WILLIS, New York 1974) 247-271; IDEM, “From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4”, *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (Morton Smith Fest., ed. J. NEUSNER, Leiden 1975) 75-106.

(5) D. L. TIEDE, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia 1980).

Luke is being understood as a thoughtful interpreter of Jewish and Old Testament tradition, an aspect which has been minimized, if not neglected altogether, due to the traditional understanding of the evangelist as a Gentile who has attempted to universalize the gospel for a Gentile world.

The opening verse of the Central Section (9,51-18,14), whose contents correspond to the subject matter of Deuteronomy 1-26 as Evans and Sanders have pointed out, contains the biblical idiom, αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ("He set his face to go to Jerusalem"). Although the Semitic flavor is recognized (*šwm pānīm 'ēl*)⁽⁶⁾ scholars are divided as to whether this idiom conveys more than the idea of "firm resolve" or "resolute determination"⁽⁷⁾. It is true enough that Greek etymology of στηρίζειν would suggest such a meaning, but an examination of the Old Testament background of the idiom suggests something more.

The following occurrences of the idiom, στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον, in the LXX suggest judgment as well as determination. In Jer 21,10 the Lord solemnly pronounces, ἐστήρικα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ταύτην εἰς κακά ("I have set my face against this city for evil". See also 3,12 where the preposition ἐπὶ is used in the sense of "against"). It is in Ezekiel that the idiom occurs most frequently, often preceded by the epithet, "son of man": στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ... καὶ προφητεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ("Set your face against Jerusalem... and you will prophesy against the land of Israel", 27,7; see also 6,2; 13,17; 15,7; 21,2)⁽⁸⁾. As seen in these examples the prophet is commissioned by God to deliver a message of judgment. It is in this sense that the prophet is to "set his face".

⁽⁶⁾ Luke 9,51-56 is replete with septuagintalisms: ἐγένετο δέ approximates the Hebrew *way*hi* ("and it came to pass"); the καὶ immediately preceding the idiom in question approximates ὅτι on analogy with the use of *waw* in Hebrew meaning "that"; the ἐν τῷ infinitive construction is Semitic; the idiom in question, of course, is Semitic, as well as the similar one, ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ("He sent messengers before his face"); and there is the allusion to Elijah (2 Kgs 1,10.12) in v. 54. Also, Evans (p. 40) sees in the curious *hapax legomenon*, ἀνάλημψις ("taking up" or "ascension"), a possible reference to the Ἀνάλημψις Μουσεως traditions.

⁽⁷⁾ Most commentators take this phrase to mean simply that Jesus has resolutely determined to go to Jerusalem. After a survey of the related literature I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter 1978) 405, concludes that "the phrase is used here to stress Jesus' own decision to go to Jerusalem without being diverted from his intention". Likewise, E. LOHSE, *TDNT* 6:776, states: "To turn one's face in a particular direction is to declare the firm intention of following this course without deviation". These comments are not incorrect, but the idiom can carry a much more significant meaning.

⁽⁸⁾ J. H. DAVIES, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel", *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 2 (ed. F. L. CROSS, Berlin 1964) 164-169, has argued that Luke's language appears to be following the language of Ezekiel more than the similar language of Jeremiah. Because of the judgmental nature of the idiom in Ezekiel he argues that the idiom must have a similar idea of judgment in Luke.

Some scholars, however, have rejected the idea of judgment because Luke's rendering of the idiom does not contain the preposition ἐπὶ (i.e., "against")⁽⁹⁾. Without this preposition, it is argued, the idiom loses its connotation of judgment and means no more than firm resolve. But there is another dimension to this idiom that has been discussed which may aid in clarifying this issue. Recently W. H. Brownlee has argued that the idiom, "to set one's face", often has the technical connotation of divine commission⁽¹⁰⁾. He has cited numerous Ugaritic parallels in which the idiom is used in the sense of dispatch. Two examples will suffice:

King Pabil verily cried: "Then shall you verily set your faces toward the munificent Keret and tell the munificent Keret: 'The message of King Pabil is this...'" [The message is given and the messengers depart]⁽¹¹⁾.

Then verily they set their faces toward the munificent Keret, they lifted up their voices and cried: "The message of King Pabil is this..." [The message is then relayed]⁽¹²⁾.

In these instances a god or king commissions his messenger with a message and sends him off to a given destination with the imperative, "Set your face towards..."⁽¹³⁾. Although several Hebrew words are used to convey this idiom *šwm* is the most frequent. However, the LXX consistently uses στήριζειν, the tradition with which Luke, of course, would be familiar. Naturally we cannot suppose that Luke was aware of such Ugaritic parallels, but the fact that the idiom prefaces the travel narrative is evidence that the sense of dispatch has presented itself to the evangelist.

There are other examples of the idiom used in the Old Testament which supports this meaning of dispatch. In Genesis Jacob is warned by God in a dream and told to go to Gilead (31,13). To escape Naban Jacob "set his face for the hill country of Gilead" (31,21). In Numbers King Balak commissions the prophet Balaam to curse the approaching tribes of Israel (22,4-25). Balaam "set his face toward the wilderness" where Israel was encamped (24,1) and then uttered his oracle (24,3-9).

⁽⁹⁾ J. STARCKY, "Obfirmavit faciem suam ut iret Jerusalem", *RSR* 39 (1951) 197-202; T. ZAHN, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (KZNT 3, Leipzig 1920) 397, n. 28; W. RADL, *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte* (Bern 1975) 119.

⁽¹⁰⁾ W. H. BROWNLEE, "To Set One's Face", paper read at the Pacific Coast Regional Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in March, 1980. Brownlee believes that the idiom so clearly implies dispatch that he has concluded that the prophet Ezekiel in fact journeyed to the various places towards which he "set his face" as commanded by Yahweh. See BROWNLEE, "Ezekiel", *ISBE* 2(1982) 254-255.

⁽¹¹⁾ BROWNLEE cites G. R. DRIVER, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh 1956) 35 (Keret I: v: 12-13, 31-34).

⁽¹²⁾ DRIVER, 35 (Keret I: vi: 5-8).

⁽¹³⁾ Other examples would include: DRIVER, 35-37 (Keret I: vi: 35-42), 55 (Aqhat II: vi: 45-49, 52), 57 (Aqhat III: vi: 17-22), 75 (Baal VI: ii: 23-32), et passim. The Ugaritic verb is *ytn*, which is cognate to *ntn* of the Hebrew.

It would appear, then, that the idiom, "to set one's face", connotes the sense of dispatch. But what is not clear is whether the idiom as it is used in Luke connotes a sense of judgment. By itself the idiom cannot decide the issue. But when the idiom is understood as referring to a commission then we must look at Jesus' message for Jerusalem, his destination, to determine the implication of the idiom. The idea that the idiom does indeed connote an aspect of judgment is apparent when it is observed that Jesus delivers oracles of woe and destruction for the city. It is especially important to note that Jesus' lament for the city of Jerusalem (19,41-46) is found only in Luke and is heavily dependent upon the language of the prophetic tradition (cp., Jer 6,6; Ezek 4,2; 21,6-12; also cp. Luke 19,46 with Jer 7,11)⁽¹⁴⁾. Luke's account of Jesus' prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem (21,20-24) differs greatly from the Markan parallel (13,14-23)⁽¹⁵⁾ and reveals the same kind of dependence upon the language of the prophetic tradition concerned with the first destruction of the temple (cp., Jer 4,4; 7,34; 22,5; Ezek 21,22).

It is likely, then, that the appearance of this idiom, popular in prophetic literature, though not limited to it, at the beginning of the Central Section in Luke is meant to convey more than the idea of firm resolve or determination. Seen against a prophetic background it implies the idea of divine commission or dispatch. It is not simply that Jesus has made up his mind to go to Jerusalem, but that he has been sent by God to the city and has been given a message of judgment. It is suggested here that in his use of this particular biblical idiom Luke has highlighted Jesus' prophetic role and has set the context of the journey to Jerusalem against the background of a divine commission to proclaim a word of judgment.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Trinity Western College
7600 Glover Road
Langley, British Columbia
V3A 4R9 Canada

Craig A. EVANS

⁽¹⁴⁾ So DODD, "The Fall of Jerusalem", 52.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The difference is so great that DODD (see p. 49) suspects that Luke had access to an independent oracle tradition concerned with the destruction of Jerusalem.

What Kind of Servants are we? (Luke 17,10)

A brief survey of translations and other exegetical tools confirms one's suspicions about the uncertainty of the meaning given to the adjective *achreioi* in Lk 17,10: *douloi achreioi esmen*.

La Biblia⁽¹⁾ employs the word "inutiles"; similarly, *La Bibbia*⁽²⁾ "servi inutili", the *Nova Vulgata*⁽³⁾ "inutiles", *Das Neue Testament*⁽⁴⁾ "unnütze", Zerwick, in his *Latin Analysis*⁽⁵⁾, "inutiles". *BAG*⁽⁶⁾ begins its report with the translation: "useless, worthless". Liddell-Scott⁽⁷⁾ give the first instance "useless, unprofitable, unfit".

Verging away from this common translation is, for example, *La Sainte Bible*⁽⁸⁾ which has "pauvres serviteurs" and writes in a footnote, "La traduction commune 'des serviteurs inutilés' s'adapte mal à la situation". The English, revised Zerwick *Analysis*⁽⁹⁾ suggests "unprofitable" rather than "useless": "...the master receives the service due him; for doing what is expected of him a servant can claim no credit". The fuller presentation of *BAG*⁽¹⁰⁾ notes that, as regards the translation "useless, worthless": "Lk 17,10 the adjective, in this sense at least, can be dispensed with (Zahn) and hence is omitted by many following Sin. Syr."; but, noting the possibility of a more generalized sense of the word: "'unworthy, miserable'", *BAG* concludes, "there is no decisive reason for rejecting a reading so well attested as this". Thus *BAG* appears to reject the translation "useless, worthless".

Representing another approach to the translation of *achreioi* are, for example, *The Complete Bible*⁽¹¹⁾, "We are good-for-nothing slaves" and the

(1) *La Biblia* (Barcelona 1976).

(2) *La Bibbia* (Torino 1980).

(3) *Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sacrorum Editio* (Città del Vaticano 1979).

(4) *Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift, Das Neue Testament* (Stuttgart 1979).

(5) M. ZERWICK, *Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graeci* (Roma 1966) 186.

(6) W. BAUER, W. F. ARNDT, F. W. GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago 1952) 128.

(7) H. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, [ed. H. S. Jones] (Oxford 1940).

(8) *La Sainte Bible, L'Evangile selon Saint Luc*, v. 33, trans. by Chanoine OSTY (Paris 1961) 124.

(9) *An Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, v. 1, trans. and rev. by M. GROSVENOR and M. ZERWICK (Roma 1974) 250.

(10) *BAG*, *op. cit.*

(11) *The Complete Bible, An American Translation*, trans. by E. GOODSPEED (Chicago 1939).

NEB⁽¹²⁾, "We are servants and deserve no credit". Similarly, *The Jerusalem Bible*⁽¹³⁾ translates "We are merely servants", the *Oxford Annotated Bible*⁽¹⁴⁾ writes "unworthy servants" and the *Sagrada Biblia* translates "Siervos somos sin provecho"⁽¹⁵⁾.

To conclude this short survey we note the opinion of J. Jeremias, "nicht unnütz, sondern armselig"⁽¹⁶⁾. In this he is followed by W. Grundmann, "Da sie ihre Pflicht erfüllt haben, sind sie nicht faul oder unnütz, sondern arm"⁽¹⁷⁾.

Given the problem expressed by such a variety of interpretations, it is worthwhile to suggest a solution in a slightly different direction. The hypothesis of this note is that the beginning of Lk 17,10 should read something like, "We are servants to whom no favor is due". The reasons for suggesting this translation are two: from structure and from etymology.

1. Lk 17,10 is clearly an application or conclusion of vv. 7-9. Within vv. 7-9 two ways of handling a situation are opposed, i.e., v. 8 vs v. 7; v. 9 is a reflective sharpening of the difference represented in the opposing ways of conduct in vv. 7-8. Crucial to v. 9 is the idea that the master does not owe the servant gratitude for fulfilling his obligations. Verse 9 both sums up the sense of vv. 7-8 and is the basis for the application to the apostles. Since v. 9 opposes two concepts, *echei charin tōi doulōi* and *epoiēsen ta diachthenta*, it is this opposition which should be represented in v. 10, the application verse. Indeed, one half of this opposition is expressed in v. 10: *hote poiēsēte ta diachthenta humin...* Thus it seems clear from the parallel structure imposed by the nature of the parable that *achreioi* should represent the other half of the opposition, i.e., "we are not owed *charis*". It seems proper, then, from literary structure to translate: "We are servants to whom no favor is due...".

2. The word *achreios* is traceable to the verb *chraō*, which in turn has four basic orientations expressed by *chraō*, *kichrēmi*, *chraomai* and *chrē*. In regard to this last-mentioned, Liddell-Scott reflects the difficulty in tracing the etymological origins of these words when noting: "Origin and historical order of the forms and senses not clear"⁽¹⁸⁾. In view of the parallelism demanded by the parable for its application and the relative uncertainty of the influence of the family to which *achreioi* etymologically belongs, one can suggest that *achreioi* is to take its meaning in Lk 17,10 from the sense involved in *chrē*, i.e., the sense of necessity, due, obligation.

More specifically, among the meanings of *achreios* one meets the adverbial use (*achreion*) of the adjective in two interesting places. In *Odyssey*

⁽¹²⁾ *The New English Bible* (Oxford 1970).

⁽¹³⁾ *The Jerusalem Bible* (New York 1968).

⁽¹⁴⁾ *The Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha* (Oxford 1965).

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Sagrada Biblia*, ed. by J. BOYER and F. BURGOS (Madrid 1951).

⁽¹⁶⁾ J. JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen 1962) 192, n. 6.

⁽¹⁷⁾ W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, *Th. Handkommentar z. Neuen Testament* (Berlin 1961) 334.

⁽¹⁸⁾ LIDDELL-SCOTT, *Lexicon*, vol. 2, p. 2002, col. 2.

18.163, Penelope, in "an effort to disguise her feelings, makes a forced laugh (*achreion d'egelasan*)" ⁽¹⁹⁾. This apparently means that she laughed in a way not due to the circumstances. Similarly, *Theocritus* 25.72 "*achreion klazein* to bark without need or cause" (Liddell-Scott) ⁽²⁰⁾. Adverbially, at least, there are sure signs that the word is related to a meaning involving action due to, owed to (someone, something); it is a meaning very well suited to Lk 17,10.

Etymologically, then, there seems to be good grounds for understanding *achreioi* to mean "those to whom something is not due, owed".

Joining the two arguments based on literary structure and etymology, it seems justifiable that one translate the beginning words of Lk 17,10: "We are servants to whom no favor is owed". Such a translation puts an end to the puzzling questions arising in a reader's mind from translations now used: "Why are the servants called 'poor, useless, unprofitable, miserable, humble', or 'merely servants'?"

Loyola University of Chicago
Rome Center
Via Massimi 114a
Rome 00136.

John J. KILGALLAN, S. J.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 297, col. 2.

⁽²⁰⁾ *Ibid.*

A Note on *LR'WT* in Ps 40,13

The attitude of Mitchell Dahood to the consonantal text of the MT is well-known⁽¹⁾. Therefore it is with some surprise that one reads his translation of Ps 40,13 and the accompanying comment on *lr'wt*:

Alas, evils have encompassed me,
till they are without number;
my iniquities have overtaken me,
and I am unable to escape.
They are more numerous than the hairs of my head,
and my heart fails me.

unable to escape. Reading (for MT *lir'öt*, "to see") *lid'öt*, "to fly, escape." The same confusion between *daleth* and *resh* has been documented in II Sam xxii 11⁽²⁾.

It is the contention of this note that the emendation uncharacteristically proposed by Dahood is unnecessary, and indeed that it misses the point of the image the poet has employed.

The background against which this passage is to be understood has been provided by T. Collins, in his article on the physiology of tears in the OT⁽³⁾. In this illuminating study, Collins has clarified a number of passages in OT poetry that deal either explicitly (e.g. Lam 2,18-19) or implicitly and allusively (e.g. Ps 31,12) with weeping. His thesis, briefly, is that the OT poets used a stock of traditional vocabulary and a store of images descriptive of weeping, drawn from their understanding of human physiology. According to Collins, these motifs include the wasting of the eyes caused by tears, whose source is the intestines. Tears arise "from a break-down of the firm substance of the heart which becomes weak and turns to water. The water then makes its way out through throat and eyes and appears as tears running down the face⁽⁴⁾".

Against this background, the meaning of two phrases in Ps 40,13 becomes clear. The first, *wl' yklti lr'wt*, means "I am unable to see", the

⁽¹⁾ This note was completed shortly after hearing of Father Dahood's untimely death and is dedicated to his memory — a great scholar and a friend.

⁽²⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City, NY 1966), 244 (translation) and 247 (comment).

⁽³⁾ Published in two parts: T. COLLINS, "The Physiology of Tears", *CBQ* 33 (1971) 18-38; 185-197.

⁽⁴⁾ COLLINS, "Physiology", 31.

result of what Collins has described as the wasting or dimming of the eyes through weeping. Note the similar situation described in Lam 5,17 ('l zh hyh dwh lbnw // 'l 'lh hškw 'ynyw), which Collins translates, "Because of this our hearts have become sick; because of these things our eyes are darkened⁽⁵⁾". The second phrase whose point becomes clear is *wlby 'zbny*, rendered by Dahood as "my heart fails me". But given the understanding of tears as resulting from the breakdown or melting of the heart, welling up through the throat and streaming from the eyes, *wlby 'zbny* should be translated quite literally as "my heart has left me" (in the form of tears).

The point of the passage (a poetic description of weeping) has perhaps escaped commentators because of the order of the phrases in question; that is, one might have expected *wlby 'zbny* to be followed (rather than to be preceded) by *wl' ykly lr'wt*, with some such translation as "my heart has left me (in the form of tears), so that I cannot see (because of the wasting of my eyes through weeping)". However, the reversal of the expected order, a variation known in classical studies as *hysteron proteron*⁽⁶⁾, would presumably be an aspect of the style and poetic license of the poet.

This interpretation of Ps 40,13 is confirmed by the parallel in Ps 38,11, where we find a similar statement (this time in the expected order):

lby šrhṛ
'zbny khy
w'wr 'yny gm hm 'yn 'ty
My heart is churning,
my strength has left me,
and the light of my eye, it too, is no longer with me⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁵⁾ COLLINS, "Physiology", 31; his comment on Lam 5,17 is worth quoting: "That we are here in a weeping context is evident from vs. 15: 'our dancing has been turned into mourning'. From what has been said about the eyes being wasted by tears it is clear that 17b is a reference to the weeping that is part of the mourning (darkened means weakened by tears). The parallelism of the line can only be taken as evidence that the writer *associated both eyes and heart in the one act of weeping*" (emphasis added). This is exactly the point we wish to make about Ps 40,13.

⁽⁶⁾ I am grateful to M. L. BARRÉ for reminding me of the phenomenon.

⁽⁷⁾ COLLINS, "Physiology", 190; he analyzes MT *hm* as *hū* + enclitic *mem* ("it, too"). See also his comments on Lam 2,19 and Ps 22,15-16b on p. 192; and note the combination of the darkening of the eyes motif from Lam 5,17 with the inability to see (with *r'h*) motif of Psalms 38 and 40 in Ps 69,24: *thšknh 'ynyhm mr'wt* ("may their eyes become darkened so that they cannot see"). This is only one of a considerable number of connections between Psalms 40 and 69 (cf. G. BRAULIK, *Psalm 40 und der Gottesknecht* [FzB 18; Würzburg 1975] 126-128). One other connection, revealed by the presence of the weeping motif in Ps 40,13, may be noted. The rare verb *'ppw* ("have encompassed") appears only here and in Pss 18,5 (= 2 Sam 22,5), 116,3, and Jon 2,6; in each case (possibly excepting Ps 116,3), the image seems to be that of a flood overwhelming the poet. So BRAULIK, 227: "Sie steht immer in Zusammenhang mit den Chaosfluten... bzw. der Scheol (Ps 116,3)"; A. A. ANDERSON, *The Book of Psalms I* (NCB; Greenwood, SC 1972) 319: "The 'evils' are depicted as the waters of a flood threatening to destroy the afflicted..."; C. A. BRIGGS, *The*

Understood thus, vv. 13b and 13c of Psalm 40 form an ABAB pattern (in which the B elements describe the phenomenon of vision hampered by weeping). Thus Dahood's emendation may be discounted, and his translation revised as follows:

A My iniquities have overtaken me,
 B and I cannot see;
 A they are more numerous than the hairs of my head,
 B and my heart has left me.

The Catholic University of America
 Washington, DC 20064

John S. KSELMAN

Book of Psalms I (ICC; Edinburgh 1906) 356. While the verb 'pp does not appear in Psalm 69, the image, expressed otherwise, does, in vv 2-4. The comment of Collins on these verses could apply as well to Ps 40,13: "The image of rising flood waters is not just arbitrarily selected but is suggestive of, and perhaps evoked by, the waters of tears which rise up within the poet as he weeps. They reach his throat in vs. 2 and his eyes in vs. 4. What we are dealing with is perfect example of poetic ambiguity as a consciously artistic effect. The poet has cleverly interwoven the two ideas of external danger and internal emotional reaction into the one image of rising flood water" ("Physiology", 194).

The Text of Psalm 90,5

The Massoretic text of Ps 90,5 reads

zʿramtām šēnā yīhyū babbōqer keḥašīr yaḥālōp

This verse has presented difficulties to both ancient and modern interpreters. The Septuagint renders

τὰ ἐξουθενώματα αὐτῶν ἔτη ἔσονται
τὸ πρῶτὶ ὥσει χλόη παρέλθοι,

(Years shall be their despicable things; let the morning pass away as grass). The Vulgate similarly translates "quae pro nihilo habentur eorum anni erunt..." (things that are accounted as nothing shall their years be...). In this it may be influenced by the Greek ἐξουθενώματα. The Targum paraphrases "And if they will not return thou wilt bring upon them death - *mwt'* - as if they will be sleeping - *dmkyn*". The Peshitta rather differently offers "*šrbthwn* -their generation (offspring)⁽¹⁾ will be as years...". It is thus clear that the translators of the ancient Versions did not speak with one voice in their interpretation of the Massoretic text.

Of modern translations we may note the following. The RSV renders "Thou didst sweep them away; they are like a dream, like grass which is renewed in the morning". The NEB rearranges the text and renders "A night-watch passes, and thou hast cut them off - *zrmtm* -; they are like a dream at daybreak"⁽²⁾. Again the JB offers "You brush men away", although adding that the Hebrew has "sweep them away". But none of these versions offers a satisfactory interpretation of the verse.

The renderings of some individual scholars do not differ significantly from these biblical translations. Thus C. E. Briggs in his *ICC* commentary offered "Thou didst flood them away"⁽³⁾, and W. S. McCullough "sweep men away"⁽⁴⁾. G. R. Driver thought that the verb *zrm* here meant "carried away"⁽⁵⁾, and S. B. Freedhof likewise "carry away as a flood"⁽⁶⁾. Again

⁽¹⁾ This Syriac term covers such nuances as "generation, family, propagation" in many instances in biblical (e.g., Gen 10,5,20,31; Ezra 2,59; Matt 1,17) and later literature. See R. PAYNE SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, II (Oxford 1901) cols. 4323-24.

⁽²⁾ See L. H. BROCKINGTON, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford-Cambridge 1973) 145.

⁽³⁾ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, II (Edinburgh 1907) 271-274.

⁽⁴⁾ *Interpreter's Bible*, IV (Nashville, TE 1955) 489.

⁽⁵⁾ *Eissfeldt Festschrift* (BZAW 77; Berlin 1958) 44.

⁽⁶⁾ *The Book of Psalms* (Cincinnati 1938) 262.

Mitchell Dahood translated "pluck them"(⁷), while Oswald Loretz suggested "hemmst sie" (thou dost hinder, interrupt them)(⁸).

Other scholars resorted to emendation of the Massoretic *zrmtm šēnā*. E. J. Kissane reconstructed it to read *dr mty m šānā* (the space of 200 years)(⁹). Both *BH³* and *BHS* note the proposals *zr'tm šēnā* (thou scatterest them as a dream). H. J. Kraus proposed *zr'tm*, translating "säst sie" (thou sowest them), and further assumes that *šēnā* is a haplography for *šānā šānā* (year by year)(¹⁰).

But the notion of "flooding", "sweeping" or "carrying away" has no meaning in immediate association with *šnh*, taken as either "sleep" or "year" nor indeed with the second colon of the line which pertains to the growth of grass. Noting that *zrm* has the force of "pouring down" as a thunder shower in Ps 77,18, KBL added that *zrmtm* (qal: pf. sf.) in Ps 90,5 is "ungedeutet/unexplained". Certainly, if the term there is regarded as having the same meaning as in Ps 77,18 it is indeed inexplicable.

It has been observed that *zrmtm* is in a clause which parallels *keḥāsīr yaḥālōp* (as grass undergoes change). This latter clause is in turn further defined in the next line (vs. 6): "In the morning it sprouts and blossoms, in the evening it fades and withers". The concept of the changing nature of grass is therefore parallel in substance to the Massoretic *zrmtm šnh*. It is here that the Syriac rendering of *zrmtm* as *šbrthwn*, "their issue, propagation, offspring" is suggestive.

How then did the Syriac translator arrive at this interpretation? He was apparently aware of the Hebrew word *zrmh* whose construct *zirmat* appears in Ezek 23,20 and seems to derive from the root *zrm* "to flow, issue". More significantly the actual form *zirmātām* (sing. noun, with 3rd masc. pl. pronom. suf.) appears in the same verse. This verse pertains to Israel's idolatry with her Egyptian paramours, and the noun is used of the reproductive seed or issue of horses. It is there represented by the Septuagint αἰδοῖα (vain, shameful things, cf. Latin *pudenda*), the Vulgate *fluxus* (fusion, effusion), the Targumic *šnt* (stanches), and the Syriac *ḥnyhwn* (privy parts). It is doubtless this use of the term in Ezekiel 23 which accounts for the derogatory meaning attached to it in Ps 90,5 by some of the ancient Versions. As we have noted the Septuagint offers τὰ ἐξουθενώματα αὐτῶν (their despicable things), the Vulgate *quae pro nihilo habentur* (things that are accounted for nothing), and the Targum paraphrases in terms of "death". With greater insight, however, the Syriac translator recognised the Hebrew *zrmtm* here as having a natural secondary meaning such as "progeny, generation, offspring". Accordingly *zrmtm* which is pointed as a verb with a plural masculine accusative suffix (them) in Ps 90,5 should be pointed as a noun with a plural pronominal suffix (their) - *zirmātām* - as in Ezekiel 23,20 and translated "their offspring".

But what is the antecedent of "their offspring"? It has been proposed by some scholars that verse 4 should be transposed to follow immediately

(⁷) *Psalms* II (AB 17; Garden City, NY 1968) 321.

(⁸) *Die Psalmen* II (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979) 17, 20.

(⁹) *The Book of Psalms* II (Dublin 1954) 101-102.

(¹⁰) *Psalmen* II (BKAT XV/2; Neukirchen 1960) 627-628.

after verse 2⁽¹¹⁾. That verse is concerned with the enduring nature of Yahweh who exists "from eternity to eternity". Verse 4 which speaks of a thousand days in Yahweh's sight as being equivalent to one day in the life of man would follow naturally on this. Verse 3 then refers to "man" and "the sons of men" returning, at Yahweh's request, to dust. These combined nouns are in turn the antecedent of "their offspring" which follows.

Again the Massoretic term *šēnâ* has, as we have seen, been variously rendered by the Versions and commentators as "sleep" and "years". Even the Syriac translator, who was so perceptive in his understanding of *zrmtm*, nodded here, and influenced perhaps as he often was by the Septuagint, renders *šnt* "sleep". However, neither "years" nor "sleep" suits the context, the burden of which is the transitory and changing nature of man's existence. Hence, it would seem that the Hebrew consonants *šnh* should be pointed as the feminine participle *šōnâ* "changeth". In using this term the Psalmist is once again emphasising a basic difference between the divine and human natures. Throughout his life man is subject to change and decline. By contrast God is not only eternal, but changeless. Like the author of Mal 3,6 the Psalmist could likewise envisage Yahweh saying *lō' šānîṭ* - "I do not change".

Both *yihyû* and *babbōqer* seem to be intrusions in the text. If the verb *yihyû* is to have a nominal antecedent it can only be *zrmtm* which is, however, already supplied with the participle *šōnâ*. It may possibly be argued that it belongs to the next clause and rendered "they will be as grass that undergoes change". But though intelligible, this would mean a singular noun (*zrmh*) with a plural verb *yhyw*. *babbōqer* is commonly regarded as a gloss since it is meaningless in verse 5, and seems rather to be an insertion from the beginning of verse 6 where it is necessary to the sense of the line.

The comparison of man with the ephemeral nature of grass, which is the substance of the second half of verse 5, is a familiar theme in the Old Testament (e.g., Pss 37,2; 103,15; Isa 40,6-7). But of particular relevance to our interpretation of Ps 90,5 is Job 14,1:

"Man that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble.
He comes forth like a flower, and withers,
And flesh as a shadow and continues not".

The "man that is born of woman" here is thus subject to the same change and destiny as "the offspring" of "the sons of men" in Ps 90,5. We may then render verse 5 (and 6)

"Their offspring changeth, as grass undergoing change
In the morning it sprouts and flourishes,
In the evening it fades and withers".

University College of North Wales
Dept. of Biblical Studies
Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG
United Kingdom

Charles WHITLEY

⁽¹¹⁾ See e.g., *BH³*, *BHS*, and cf. too LORETZ, 17,20 (n. 8).

***rē' êkā* in Ps 139,17: ein adverbialer Akkusativ**

„Wie schwierig sind für mich deine Gedanken“. Diese zur Zeit gängige Übersetzung von Ps 139,17a liest sich wie die Glosse eines ratlosen Lesers aus der Antike. Und der Satz hätte heute noch seine Berechtigung; denn trotz der hervorragenden Arbeiten von J. Holman⁽¹⁾ und M. Dahood⁽²⁾ zu diesem Psalm bleibt noch vieles dunkel.

In v. 17 wird vor allem die *Bedeutung* von *rē' êkā* diskutiert. Während die alten Übersetzungen es durchweg von *rēā'* – 'Freund' herleiten, haben sich die neueren meist für *rēā'* – 'Gedanke' entschieden. In dieser Bedeutung begegnet das Wort ja bereits in Ps 139,2.

Soweit ich sehe, hat sich bisher niemand über die *syntaktische Funktion* von *rē' êkā* in v. 17 Gedanken gemacht. Ganz selbstverständlich hat man es immer als das Subjekt des Satzes angesehen. Das muß es aber durchaus nicht sein. Das Hebräische kennt einen adverbialen Akkusativ⁽³⁾, der vor allem in der Dichtung sehr beliebt gewesen zu sein scheint. M. Dahood hat allein 35 Beispiele aus dem Psalter zusammengestellt⁽⁴⁾; und diese Liste ist sicherlich nicht vollständig. Ein solcher adverbialer Akkusativ begegnet z.B. im Ps 139 bereits in v. 10: *jmīnekā*⁽⁵⁾.

Ich gebe zunächst Text und Übersetzung von Ps 139,16-18.

v. 16: *glmj rā' ū' 'ênēkā*
wē' al-siprēkā kullām
jikkātēbū jōm jōm (!) juṣṣārū
wē'lō' 'eḥād bāhem

v. 17: *wē'lī mah-jāq'rū rē' êkā*
'ēl meh 'āṣmū rā' šēhem

v. 18: *'esprēm mēḥōl jirbūn*
hēqīṣōtī wē' ōdī 'immāk

v. 16: Meine Lebensgeschichte sahen deine Augen;
 und auf deiner Rolle war alles von ihr
 schon geschrieben, Tag für Tag entworfen,
 als noch nicht einer von ihnen da war.

(1) J. HOLMAN, "Analysis of the Text of Ps 139": BZ 14 (1970) 37-71; 198-227.

(2) M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (AB 17A; Garden City, NY 1970) 283-299.

(3) Vgl. etwa R. MEYER, *Hebräische Grammatik III. Satzlehre* (Berlin 1972) § 106.

(4) *Psalms III* 427-428.

(5) Vgl. M. DAHOOD, z. St.

- v. 17: Ja für mich, wie kostbar sind sie,
weil du sie erdacht!
O Gott, wie gewaltig ist ihre Summe!
- v. 18: Wollte ich sie zählen, mehr als der Sand wären sie:
wenn ich erwacht bin,
werde ich ewig sein bei dir.

Zur Übersetzung:

v. 16: zu *glmj* vgl. M. Dahood, *Psalms III* z. St., der es mit "life stages" übersetzt; im Deutschen sprechen wir eher von "Lebensgeschichte".

Zwischen *kullām* und *jikkātēbū* nehme ich einen sog. Zeilensprung an. M. Dahood hat für diese Stileigentümlichkeit in den Psalmen viele Beispiele gefunden. Vgl. in den *Psalms I-III* den "Index of Subjects" unter dem Stichwort "Enjambment". Statt *jāmīm* lese ich versuchsweise ohne Änderung des Konsonantentextes *jōm jōm* – "Tag für Tag". BHS geht mit der Konjekture *kol-jāmaj* in die gleiche Richtung, muß aber zu stark in den überlieferten Text eingreifen.

jšr wird auch vom mentalen und ideellen Bilden gebraucht: 'ersinnen, planen'; hier etwa: 'entwerfen'.

v. 17: *rē' êkā* ist wie gesagt ein adverbialer Akkusativ. Dieser kann verschiedene Nuancen haben: lokal, temporal, kausal usw. Hier überwiegt wohl die kausale Bedeutung. Wörtlich also: "aufgrund deiner Gedanken".

rā' šēhem: im Zusammenhang mit 'zählen' (v. 18!) hat *rō' š* normalerweise die Bedeutung: 'Summe'.

v. 18: Schon J. Holman hat das Suffix in *'esp'rēm* auf *jāmīm* bezogen⁽⁶⁾. Allerdings geht er in der Übersetzung und Deutung des Verses sonst andere Wege.

hēqīšōtī hat hier, wie M. Dahood z. St. richtig bemerkt, eschatologische Bedeutung: 'aus dem Schlaf des Todes erwachen'. Vgl. auch seinen Kommentar zu Ps 17,15 in *Psalms I*.

'ôdī: 'ôd ist ein Substantiv: 'Fortdauer'. J. Holman übersetzt: "my perpetual existence"⁽⁷⁾. Daß es sich hier um die Ewigkeit handelt, ergibt sich schon daraus, daß die Summe der Tage so groß ist, daß nicht einmal die Körner des Sandes (am Meeresstrand) zum Vergleich ausreichen. Von den Tagen des irdischen Lebens heißt es dagegen in Ps 90,12: "Unsere Tage zu zählen, lehre uns!".

'immāk: vgl. dazu auch Ps 73,23 und 25.

Benediktinerabtei Gerleve
D-4425 Billerbeck
Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Liudger SABOTTKA, OSB

⁽⁶⁾ HOLMAN, "Analysis", 207-209.

⁽⁷⁾ HOLMAN, "Analysis", 210.

Consonantal *ym*: Ending or Noun in Isa 3,13; Jer 17,16; 1 Sam 6,19

MT Isa 3,13 reads, *niššāb lārīb yhw w'ōmēd lādīn 'ammīm*, 'Yahweh has taken his place to contend, yes⁽¹⁾, he stands to judge the peoples'. Vv. 12,14-15, however, refer to the judgment of the chosen people and of its leaders in particular, so that 'peoples' in v. 13 seems out of place. E. J. Young believes that 'peoples' is a reference to the universal judgment and that v. 13 stands in relation to v. 14 which describes a particular judgment as 2,12-22 does to 3,14⁽²⁾. But 2,12-22 is separate from 3,14 whereas 3,13 occurs within a passage, 3,12-15, which refers to a particular judgment, so that Young's reasoning appears unconvincing. J. Vermeylen marginally favours the view that '*mym* refers to the Israelite populations considered unfaithful and impure by the pious Jews, reading a good deal into the text⁽³⁾.

More commonly '*mym* is emended to '*mw*, 'his people', following the LXX and Syriac⁽⁴⁾. Vermeylen maintains that this emendation does not provide a satisfactory answer as in vv. 12,14-15 the people is presented as the victim of its leaders rather than the guilty party⁽⁵⁾. Too much weight need not be attached to this objection. Elsewhere in Isaiah the people is punished for its leaders' sin. Thus, it is the leaders of Judah who are responsible for the Assyrian alliance at the time of the Syro-Ephraimite war, but the whole people will undergo punishment for this disobedience (see

⁽¹⁾ The *waw* is emphatic rather than copulative.

⁽²⁾ E. J. YOUNG, *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. 1 (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1965) 156 n. 29.

⁽³⁾ J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'Apocalyptique. Isaïe I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël*, Vol. 1 (EBib; Paris 1978) 149.

⁽⁴⁾ So BHK; BHS; G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Isaiah I-XXXVII* (ICC; Edinburgh 1912) 68; O. KAISER, *Der Prophet Jesaja. Kap. 1-12* (ATD 17; Göttingen 1963) *ad loc.*; = *Isaiah 1-12. A Commentary* (OTL; London 1972) 44; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (BKAT X/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 131; A. S. HERBERT, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah 1-39* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1973) 41; RSV; NAB, see *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (Paterson, N. J. 1970) 409; NEB, see L. H. BROCKINGTON, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible* (Oxford-Cambridge 1973) 175; JB; BJ (1961).

⁽⁵⁾ *Du prophète Isaïe*, 148.

7,17). Nevertheless, emendation of the consonantal text may not be necessary.

J. Huesman has proposed parsing the final *men* of *'mym* as enclitic⁽⁶⁾, and M. Dahood takes the *-y* to be a third person masculine singular suffix⁽⁷⁾; thus the text may represent the desired meaning without consonantal emendation. It is, however, possible to avoid positing an enclitic *mem*. We suggest reading *'ām / yōm yhw* for MT *'ammīm / yhw* moving consonantal *ym* to v. 14 and translating, '(yes, he stands to judge) the people. / The Day of Yahweh (comes with judgment, / against the elders of his people...)'. The omission of the article before *'ām* need occasion no surprise as it is frequently omitted in poetry⁽⁸⁾. No deletion of consonants is required. The syllable count of v. 13 is 6:7 according to MT, whilst the proposal to read an enclitic *mem*, vocalized *mī*⁽⁹⁾, makes it 6:8. By moving *ym* to the following verse we obtain a perfectly balanced 6:6 bicolon. Vv. 14-15 have a 6:8:9:10:9:10 shape in MT, but our suggestion to incorporate *ym* in the first colon results in a smoother 7:8:9... pattern. To be noted is the chiasmic syllable count in the last four cola (vv. 14bB-15) which tells against the proposal of BHS to delete the final colon (lacking in LXX), and against that of H. Wildberger to omit *'adōnāy*⁽¹⁰⁾, whilst the view that v. 14 is a gloss to v. 13 also seems less plausible⁽¹¹⁾.

A different instance of a *-ym* ending has been proposed for Jer 17,16a whose textual problems have not yet been convincingly resolved⁽¹²⁾. MT in fact reads *wa'ānī lō' 'aštī mērō'eh 'ahreykā wəyōm 'anūs lō' hit'awwēytī*, translated by A. Weiser, 'Ich habe mich doch nicht entzogen dem Amt des Hirten in deinem Dienst und habe den Unheilstag nicht herbeigewünscht'⁽¹³⁾, but this omits the nuance of 'hasten' that *wš* invariably carries⁽¹⁴⁾ and fails to reproduce the parallelism with *hit'awwēytī*. Furthermore, as J. Bright points out, the sense is forced⁽¹⁵⁾. LXX apparently had the same *Vor-*

(6) J. HUESMAN *apud* J. D. HUMMEL, "Enclitic *mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, especially Hebrew", *JBL* 76 (1957) 100. D. A. ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (SBLDS 3; Missoula 1972) 102, rather surprisingly writes that "the MT needs no explicit defence" when he mentions Huesman's proposal.

(7) M. DAHOOD, "Qoheleth and Northwest Semitic Philology", *Bib* 43 (1962) 353; so too W. H. IRWIN, *Isaiah* 28-33. *Translation with Philological Notes* (BibOrPont 30; Rome 1977) 148.

(8) Cf. D. N. FREEDMAN, "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry", *JBL* 96 (1977) 6.

(9) Consult HUMMEL, *JBL* 76 (1957) 90.

(10) *Jesaja*, 131.

(11) Cf. O. LORETZ's review of W. DIETRICH, *Jesaja und die Politik* (Munich 1976), *UF* 9 (1977) 393 n. 1.

(12) See the comment of F. D. HUBMANN, "Jer 18,18-23 im Zusammenhang der Konfessionen", *Le Livre de Jérémie. Le prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission*, (BETL 54; Leuven 1981) 275.

(13) A. WEISER, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia* (ATD 20/21; Göttingen 1960) 143.

(14) Cf. *BDB*, 21a; *HALAT*, 23a.

(15) J. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; Garden City 1965) 116 n. f-f.

lage⁽¹⁶⁾. Aquila and Symmachus render ἀπὸ κακίας, reading *mērā' ah*, accepted by *NEB*, 'It is not the thought of disaster that makes me press after thee'⁽¹⁷⁾. This too appears somewhat forced and the line is too long; its thirteen syllables are not balanced by the nine syllables of the parallel colon. Scholars more frequently read *lr'h* for MT *mr'h*; so *RSV*, 'I have not pressed thee to send evil'⁽¹⁸⁾. This change in the consonantal text does not, however, elicit a very satisfactory explanation of the Hebrew, and the stichometric problem remains.

J. Skinner proposes *l' šty ym r'h*, 'I have not desired the evil day', which discloses a fine parallel with the second colon, 'nor desired the day of woe', but he omits *'ahreykā*⁽¹⁹⁾. W. G. E. Watson points out that this interpretation does not require any emendation of the consonantal text for the *yod* functions as a shared consonant⁽²⁰⁾. G. del Olmo draws attention to 16,11 where *'ahrey* bears the sense of 'with' and he renders *'ahreykā*, 'putting myself at your side'⁽²¹⁾. M. Dahood shows that Ugaritic *aḥr* may bear the same connotation⁽²²⁾. Del Olmo prefers, however, for reasons of rhythm to read *'šty-m r'h*, interpreting the *mem* as enclitic, 'But I have not hastened the calamity, putting myself at your side'⁽²³⁾. Most of the versions we have considered treat v. 16 up to *hit'awwēyī* as two cola. We propose scanning the half-verse as a tricolon employing the pivot pattern⁽²⁴⁾:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>wa'ānī lō' 'aštī yōm rā' ah</i> (MT <i>mērō' eh</i>) | Syllables |
| <i>'ahreykā</i> | 9 |
| <i>w'ayōm 'anūš lō' hit'awwēyī</i> | 4 |
| | 9 |

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. *BHS*. See also 4QJer^a in J. G. JANZEN, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 6; Cambridge, MA 1973) 178.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Consult BROCKINGTON, *Hebrew Text*, 205. G. DEL OLMO, 'Notas críticas al texto hebreo de Jr. 14-17', *Claretianum* 11 (1971) 355 lists older scholars taking the same view.

⁽¹⁸⁾ So H. CUNLIFFE-JONES, *Jeremiah. God in History* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London 1966) 135f; BRIGHT, *Jeremiah*, 116; W. RUDOLPH, *Jeremia* (*HAT* I/12; Tübingen 1968) 116 ("in böser Absicht"); *NAB*, see *Textual Notes*, 420; *BJ* (1961, 1973); *JB*.

⁽¹⁹⁾ J. SKINNER, *Prophecy and Religion. Studies in the Life of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1961) 205 n. 3. So too J. A. THOMPSON, *The Book of Jeremiah* (*NI-COT*; Grand Rapids 1980) 424 and n. 2. See also BRIGHT, *Jeremiah*, 116 n. f-f.

⁽²⁰⁾ W. G. E. WATSON, "Shared Consonants in Northwest Semitic", *Bib* 50 (1969) 529.

⁽²¹⁾ *Claretianum* 11 (1971) 354, 356. Cf. *HALAT* 34b with bibliography. *HALAT*, 35a points out that in Palestine people walked behind each other where we would say: together.

⁽²²⁾ M. DAHOOD, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I", *Bib* 44 (1963) 292f.

⁽²³⁾ *Claretianum* 11 (1971) 355. He also adduces the motif of the prophet's intercession, but this is found in Skinner's version too.

⁽²⁴⁾ On the pivot pattern, cf. M. DAHOOD, "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry", *CBQ* 29 (1967) 574-579; W. G. E. WATSON, "Verse-Patterns in Ugaritic, Akkadian and Hebrew Poetry", *UF* 7 (1975) 483-492; ID., "The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian Poetry", *ZAW* 88 (1976) 239-252.

It can be seen that 'aḥ^areykā qualifies both neighbouring cola. The finely balanced 9:4:9 syllable pattern supports this interpretation, as does the chiasmic parallelism, verb: object: pivot: object: verb. Reading an enclitic (vocalized -mi) produces the same syllable count, but the chiasm is less good, and for this reason we prefer *ym r'h*. Colon 3 lacks an equivalent to *wa'ani* and so *hit'awwēyit* (four syllables) is the ballast variant of 'aṣtī (two syllables).

The remainder of the verse is clear in its meaning but there is the question of whether 'You know' goes with what precedes⁽²⁵⁾ or with what follows⁽²⁶⁾. The Massoretes put the *athnach* under *yādā'tā*, while *BHS* moves it to *špātay*. Here too we may have an instance of the pivot pattern: 'You know' belongs equally to both parts of the verse. Yahweh knows that the prophet has not longed for the *ym r'h* and that he has been honest. If 'at-tāh *yādā'tā* is indeed a pivot phrase it would form a separate colon and one might scan, 'You know / the issue of my lips, / before your face it has been'⁽²⁷⁾. The syllable count is 5:5:7. We offer the following translation of v. 16:

I have not desired the evil day
 putting myself at your side
 I have not longed for the day of woe⁽²⁸⁾
 You know
 the issue of my lips,
 before your face it has been.

Two examples of *yōm* being taken for the masculine plural ending may occur in 1 Sam 6,19a B,C, *wayyak bā'ām šib'im 'iš ḥamiššim 'elep 'iš*, 'And he slew among the people seventy men, fifty thousand men'. Modern scholars usually omit the last three words as a gloss whose function remains obscure⁽²⁹⁾. The phrase is, however, found in all the major witnesses and is therefore textually secure. We propose reading, *wayyak bā'ām šeba' yōm* (MT *šib'im*) / 'iš ḥāmēš *yōm* (MT *ḥamiššim*) / 'elep 'iš, 'And He slew the people for seven days, / men for five days, / a thousand men'. Since descending parallelism is rather rare some examples are in order. Isa 66,8 offers one day // one moment, and Job 29,2 months // days. Cant 8,12

⁽²⁵⁾ So SKINNER, *Prophecy*, 205; *RSV*; *JB*.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah*, 116; RUDOLPH, *Jeremia*, 116; *NAB*; *NEB*.

⁽²⁷⁾ See WEISER, *Jeremia*, 143.

⁽²⁸⁾ The initial *waw* would be emphatic as perhaps in colon 1 where it is often omitted.

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. *RSV*; *NEB*; *NAB*; *JB*; *BJ* (1961, 1973); S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 58; H. P. SMITH, *The Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899) 49; J. MAUHLIN, *1 and 2 Samuel* (New Century Bible; London 1971) 81; P. R. ACKROYD, *The First Book of Samuel* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1971) 62 speaks of 'confused remnants of another story'; P. K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City 1980) 131. *BHK* considers it a gloss, while P. A. H. DE BOER in *BHS* merely lists the variants in the verse. H. J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT 8/1; Gütersloh 1973) 149, 153, believes the two figures are variants.

yields the pair thousand // two hundred, *hā'elep lēkā š'elōmōh ūmā'tayim lēnōtē'rīm 'et piryō*, 'The thousand is yours, O Solomon, and two hundred for those who guard its fruit'. There may be an instance of six // five in Isa 7,8b, *ūbē'ōd šēš yōm* (MT *šiššim*) *wēhāmēš šānāh*, 'but within six cycles, even five years' (30). To be noted are the parallel collective word pairs, 'iš // 'iš and *yōm // yōm* found elsewhere in the Bible, the second also in Ugaritic (31); the pair *šeba' // hāmēš* has not to our knowledge been located elsewhere. The second line illustrates the expanded colon (32). The verb governs all three cola, and the preposition *b*, usually interpreted 'among', also has a triple-duty function so that it is better understood to introduce a direct object as in the couplet, *hikkāh šā'ul ba'alāpw wēdāwid bēribēbōtāyw*, 'Saul has slain his thousands and David his ten thousands' (1 Sam 18,7; 21,12; 29,5). The tricolon appears to be poetic. It has a 7:4:3 syllable pattern and the word count is also descending, 4:3:2. The question now arises whether the whole verse may not be poetry. We put forward the following stichometry:

| | Syllables | Words |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 wayyak b'anšē bēt šemeš | 8 | 4 |
| 2 kī rā'ū ba'arōn yhwḥ | 8 | 4 |
| 3 wayyak bā'am šeba' yōm | 7 | 4 |
| 4 'iš hāmēš yōm | 4 | 3 |
| 5 'elep 'iš | 3 | 2 |
| 6 wayyit'abbēlū hā'am | 7 | 3 |
| 7 kī hikkāh yhwḥ bā'am | 7 | 4 |
| 8 makkāh gēdōlāh | 5 | 2 |

In parallel are *nkh // nkh* (cola 1,3,7), 'anāšim // 'ām // 'ām (cola 1,3,7) and *kī // kī* (cola 2,7) (33). S. R. Driver considers *wayyak bā'am* tautologous, but repetitive parallelism is characteristic of Hebrew and Ugaritic poetry (34). The pair *wayyak // wayyak* in cola 1 and 3 suggests that, as often in Canaanite poetry, the *waw* of the second verb may be emphatic rather than copulative, 'Yes, He slew the people'. In view of *wayyak bāhem makkāh*

(30) R. ALTHANN, "YŌM, "Time" and Some Texts in Isaiah", *JNSL* 10 (1982 — forthcoming).

(31) See M. DAHOOD, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs", *Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, I, (*AnOr* 49; Rome 1972) 202 no. 230.

(32) On the expanded colon in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew, cf. S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "The Expanded Colon in Ugaritic and Biblical Verse", *JSS* 14 (1969) 176-196; ID., "The Expanded Colon, Reconsidered", *UF* 7 (1975) 261-264; Y. AVISHUR, "Addenda to the Expanded Colon in Ugaritic and Biblical Verse", *UF* 4 (1972) 1-10; E. L. GREENSTEIN, "Two Variations of Grammatical Parallelism in Canaanite Poetry and Their Psycho-linguistic Background", *JANES* 6 (1974) 96-104.

(33) On Hebrew-Ugaritic *kī // kī*, cf. M. DAHOOD, *RSP* I, 223 no. 276 (see note 31).

(34) Notes 59; *nkh // nkh* occurs in Jos 10,10; 11,8; 2 Kgs 3,24; 'ām // 'ām in Isa 18,7; 33,19; 43,20-21; Pss 144,15; 148,14; 'iš // 'ām in Isa 3,5. On identical words in parallel, see M. DAHOOD, 'Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs' in *Ras Shamra Parallels*, Vol. III (*AnOr* 51; Rome 1981) 4; IRWIN, *Isaiah*, 173.

g'dōlāh, 'And he slaughtered them with a great slaughter' (1 Sam 19,8; 23,5) and of the parallelism between cola 1 and 7, *makkāh g'dōlāh* in colon 8 completes not only colon 7 but also colon 1, so that we may speak of the division of a composite phrase and therefore of an inclusion for the whole verse. Attention is drawn to the evenly balanced syllable and word patterns of cola 1-2, which already give a hint that the two cola may not be prose. The word pattern of the verse is particularly interesting for it illustrates the broken chiasm⁽³⁵⁾. After colon 7 we should expect two four-word cola to complete the chiasm, but in fact colon 8 with only two words concludes the verse and achieves an effective end. Within the verse cola 3-7 disclose a chiasm in the word pattern.

If the verse is indeed poetry, this would explain the apparent lack of an expressed subject for *wayyak* in colon 1. Most commentators prefer to omit this verb and to follow Codex Vaticanus which reads, καὶ οὐκ ἠσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰεχονίου, 'and the sons of Jeconiah were not pleased'; *bā'ām* in colon 3 is then emended to *bāhem*⁽³⁶⁾. But the subject of *wayyak* is expressed. It appears in colon 7 for the author is employing the poetic device of delayed identification⁽³⁷⁾. We offer the following translation:

And He slew the men of Beth Shemesh
for they had gloated over⁽³⁸⁾ the ark of Yahweh.
Yes, He slew the people for seven days,
men for five days,
a thousand men.
And the people mourned
for Yahweh had slain the people
with a great slaughter.

Dept. of Religious Studies
The University of Zimbabwe
P O Box MP 167
Mount Pleasant
Harare, Zimbabwe.

R. ALTHANN, S. J.

⁽³⁵⁾ On the broken chiasm, consult H. VAN DYKE PARUNAK, "Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure", *Bib* 62 (1981) 167f.

⁽³⁶⁾ So the authors mentioned in note 29, except for RSV which follows MT in v. 19a, but then reads *bāhem*. H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD 10; Göttingen 1960) 42, 46, E. T. I & II Samuel (OTL; London 1964) 56-57, 60-61, follows Vaticanus in v. 19a but does not emend *bā'ām* to *bāhem*. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 149, keeps MT but writes, "Das Subjekt fehlt, die Aussage wird später an passenderer Stelle wiederholt".

⁽³⁷⁾ On delayed identification, cf. M. DAHOOD, "Poetry, Hebrew", *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville 1976) 671-672; L. BOADT, *Ezekiel's Oracles against Egypt. A Literary and Philological Study of Ezekiel 29-32* (*BibOrPont* 37; Rome 1980) 60-61 (with examples from Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian, Ugaritic as well as Biblical Hebrew), 80, 179.

⁽³⁸⁾ Consult J. SALOMON, «The Ark in Beth Shemesh» (Hebrew), *Beth Mikra* 61 (1975) 266-270.

Isaiah 53,8-12 and Massoretic Misconstructions

In my study "Phoenician Elements in Isaiah 52:13-53:12"⁽¹⁾, I have given a complete translation and philological commentary on the Fourth Servant Song, so here it will be necessary to explain just those points in Isa 53,8-12 where the recognition of erroneous Massoretic word-division and punctuation requires new readings and interpretations, and where a datum from Ebla permits a fresh translation of a disputed phrase.

Isa 53,8 *mē'ōšer ūmimmišpāt luqqāh*

wē'et-dôrô mî y'sôhēah

kî nigzar mē'ereš ḥayyîm

mippeša' 'ammî nāga' (MTnega') lāmô

Without restraint and without moderation he was taken away,
and of his generation who gave him a thought?

For he was cut off from the land of the living,

for the rebellion of his people he touched the waters.

of his generation: The separative force of *'et* is gradually being recognized⁽²⁾, and even the conservative *New International Version* of 1978 admits in a note the alternative translation "Yet who of his generation considered?"

his people: Another instance of *'ammî*, "his people", with the third person masculine singular suffix *-î*, can be seen in Micah 3,5, *kôh 'amar yhw' 'al-hannēbî'îm hammat'îm 'et 'ammî*, "Thus spoke Yahweh against the prophets who were misleading his people". Preceded by *panāyw*, "his face", in vs. 4 and followed by *'ālāyw*, "against him", in vs. 5 c, the suffix of *'ammî* should also be third person, as recognized by those proposing to emend *'ammî* to *'am yhw'*, "the people of Yahweh" (cf. BHK³).

he touched the waters: The repositing of nominal *nega'* to verbal *nāga'* is prompted by the identification of *mô* in *lāmô* as a byform for

(¹) In H. GOEDICKE, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Baltimore and London 1971) 63-73.

(²) See R. BORGER, *VT* 9 (1959) 85-86, on Gen 4,1; M. DAHOOD, *Bib* 55 (1974) 77, on Gen 49,25. Hence there may be no need to assume a haplography (cf. BHK³) in Gen 6,13, *wēhin'ni māšhitām 'et-hā'āreš*, "and I am going to annihilate them from the earth". Cf. the construction with *min* in 2 Chron 24,23. The apparent parallelism with *mē'al y'hūdāh* in Isa 7,17 suggests that unexplained *'et melek 'aššûr* be rendered "from the king of Assyria".

"water". As noted elsewhere⁽³⁾, the Ebla bilingual that translates Sumerian a by *ma-wu*, "water", will surely create many ripples in the pool of biblical philology. Thus at the end of Ps 66,7 difficult *lāmô*, which is lacking in some manuscripts and reads as *l'ôlām* by the Syriac, proves meaningful in view of the new Ebla information, and the final colon may now be read: *hassôrîm 'el* (MT *'al*) *y'râyāmô* (MT *yārimû*) *lāmô*, "the rebels — God hurled them into the water", an allusion to Ex 15,4, *markêbôt par'ôh w'hêlô yārāh bayyām*, "The chariots of Pharaoh and his army he hurled into the sea".

The resultant motif of touching the waters of death recalls Job 36,12, *b'selah ya'ābôrû*, "They will cross the channel", and clarifies the reading and translation of Job 33,22, *w'tigrab* (MT *wattigrab*) *laššahat napšô w'hayyâtô lēmô mêtîm* (MT *lam'êtîm*), "His soul draws near the Pit, and his life the waters of the dead". In his commentary on this passage M. H. Pope⁽⁴⁾ has observed that the line is short and possibly a word has fallen out; to remedy this he proposes the emendation *lēmē-māwet-mô*, "to the waters of Death", with the enclitic emphatic particle at the end. While the result is good, the method is somewhat maladroit; the simple repointing of consonantal *lmmtym* to *lēmô mêtîm* results in a balanced line with eight syllables in each colon and produces essentially the same meaning reached by Pope. Other instances of *mô* "water", recur in Job 6,15 and 9,30.

If this reading is sound, Job 33,22 would illustrate the breakup of the composite phrase **mô šahat*, "waters of the Pit". In fact, *mô*, "water", and *šahat*, "Pit", concur in Job 9,30-31. As Pope points out, the watery nature of the netherworld is well attested.

In our Isaian verse the contrast with *'ereš hayyîm*, "the land of the living", suffices to determine the real import of unspecified "the waters".

53,9 *wayyittên 'et-r'šā'im qibrô*
 w' et-'ôšê-rîb môtāyw (MT *'āšîr b'môtāyw*)
 'al lô' hāmās 'āšāh
 w'lô' mirmāh b'pîû

It appointed his grave with the wicked,
 and with the makers of strife his execution;
 Even though he had not done violence,
 nor was there falsehood from his mouth.

It appointed: MT active *wayyittên* may be retained when collective singular *'ammî*, "his people", is construed as the subject; 1QIs^a reads plural

⁽³⁾ See my article "A Sea of Troubles": Notes on Psalms 53:3-4 and 140:10-11", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 604-607, esp. 606. Among the new examples of *mô*, "water", may be cited Prov 23,7, *kî k'mô šô'ār* (MT *šā'ar*) *b'nepeš w'kēn* (MT *b'napšô kēn*) *hû*, "because like disgusting water in the throat, such is he". The repointing of unexplained MT *šā'ar* to *šô'ār* results from comparison with Jer 29,17, *kattē'ênîm haššô'ārîm*, "like disgusting figs". Since Prov 23,6 mentions bread and delicacies and vs. 8 speaks of vomiting, "putrid water" can be admitted to fit the context.

⁽⁴⁾ *Job* (AB 7; Garden City, N. Y. 1973) 251.

wytnw. Being a collective noun, 'ammî as the subject may be rendered either singular "it" or plural "they".

the makers of strife: a literal rendition of the proposed reading 'ôšê rîb which has manifold advantages. First, it eliminates singular 'âšîr, "rich man", a counterpart to plural r̥šâ'im, "the wicked", difficult to explain. It also disposes of much-canvassed b̥môtāyw⁽⁵⁾, which IQIs^a read bwmtyw. Then it sets up the neat chiasmus of 'ôšê-rîb, "makers of strife", and hāmās 'âšāh, "had (not) done violence", in the following colon. That rîb and hāmās belong to the same semantic field is confirmed by Hab 1,3 šôd w̥hāmās, "devastation and violence" // rîb ûmādôn, "strife and contention", whereas the sequence of the three nouns rîb, hāmās, and mirmāh, "falsehood", is matched by Ps 55,10-12 hāmās w̥rîb, "violence and strife", followed by tōk ûmirmāh, "injury and falsehood" in vs. 12. Fourth, the reading 'ôšê-rîb recovers the word balance in the parallel cola, with four words in each colon and, finally, the vocalization rîb points to the correct punctuation in vs. 12c where rabbîm, "many", repointed to rābîm, "quarrelers", makes an apter counterpart to pōṣ̌'im, "rebellious". The parallelism in 12c resumes the verbal sequence of vs. 8d, p̣ša' 'ammî, "the rebellion of his people", and vs. 9b 'ôšê rîb, phrases which in turn evoke Ps 18,44 rîbê 'ām, "quarrels of the people".

his execution: an attempt to reproduce plural môtāyw which I construe as a plural of majesty; cf. Ezek 28,10 môtê 'ārêlîm for the only other attestation māwet in the plural. It would appear that the death of the Servant was a solemn public affair.

53,10a wayhwh ḥap̣eš daḳk'ô ḥāḥillî (MT *heḥelî*)

'im tāšîm (MT 'im-tāšîm) 'āšām napšô

But Yahweh willed to crush him, pierce him,
the Awesome considered his life a guilt offering.

the Awesome: The identification of 'im as the stative participle of the root 'ym found in the adjective 'āyôm, "awesome, dreadful", and in 'ēmāh, "awe, dread", uncovers the composite divine name *yhwh-'im, "Yahweh the Awesome". Cf. my discussion of Num 12,6 in *Psalms II*, 354⁽⁶⁾; where there is no need to repoint 'im to 'ēm, since 'im, "Awesome", may handily be analyzed as the Canaanite form preserved in the archaic text of Num 12,6. Cf. the Ugar. PN š'im, "the Lamb of the Awesome", in *UT*, 1134:7; "the one of the Awesome" is also possible but less likely. Since the root š'm

⁽⁵⁾ Consult W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine", *VTS* 4 (1957) 242-258.

⁽⁶⁾ As well as L. VIGANÒ, *Nomi e titoli di YHWH alla luce del semitico del Nord-ovest* (BiOr 31; Rome 1976) 110-118. The Ebla personal name i-mu-damu / 'imu-damu / may well signify "Awesome is Damu". The text number is MEE 2,47 rev. I 3, published by G. PETTINATO, *Testi amministrativi della biblioteca L. 2769. Materiali epigrafici di Ebla 2* (Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, 1980) 311.

seems not to exist in Northwest Semitic, the analysis into $\text{š} + \text{'im}$ becomes difficult to impugn. Cf. Jer 50,38 where 'ēmīm , "the Awesome Ones", designates pagan gods, and the PN 'hy'm in 2 Sam 23,33 and 1 Chron 11,35. Since MT 'āhī'ām creates an inexplicable name⁽⁷⁾, one feels authorized to read 'āhī'im , "My brother is the Awesome". In 1 Chron 11,35 the LXX reads Achim which supports our contention.

considered: MT tāšīm may be parsed as the third-person masculine singular with the preformative $t-$, as first pointed out by H. J. van Dijk⁽⁸⁾. The balance between the qtl form hāpēs , "He willed", and $yqtl$ yāšīm , "He considered", is a characteristic of Canaanite poetic style⁽⁹⁾. The qtl - $yqtl$ sequence can also be seen in vs. 12c, discussed immediately.

53,12c w'hū' hēt'-rābīm (MT rabbīm) nāšā'
 $\text{w'lappōš'im yaggā'}$

It was he who bore the sins of quarrelers,
 and for the rebellious made entreaty.

quarrelers: as noted above, the recovery of rīb , "strife", in vs. 9 associates it with peša' , "rebellion", in vs. 8. This means that MT rabbīm , "the great", which fits the parallelism with 'āšūmīm "the powerful", in vs. 12a, is less suitable as the opposite number of pōš'im , "the rebellious", which expresses a moral quality, whereas rabbīm , "the great", is morally neutral. A similar problem with the consonants rb can be observed in Isa 63,1c where MT rab was understood as rāb by Symmachus who renders hypermachōn "defending", and the Vulgate which has propugnator . That rāb l'hōšā' , "striving to save", is a superior reading may be deduced from a comparison with Isa 19,20, $\text{w'yišlah lāhem mōšā' wārāb}$, "And he will send to them a savior and defender".

In summary, it was the Massoretic misdivision 'āšir b'mōtāyw for 'ōšē-rib mōtāyw that has impeded the understanding of Isa 53,9 in particular⁽¹⁰⁾;

(7) Consult M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen* (Stuttgart 1928) 192, who after an attempt to explain 'ām through Arab. 'āma , "herrschen, regieren", must conclude with the admission "Doch auch das ist vollkommen unsicher". See also W. BAUMGARTNER, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden 1967) I, 32a.

(8) "Does Third Masculine Singular TAQTUL Exist in Hebrew", *VT* 19 (1969) 440-447, esp. 442-443. He understands the servant as the subject of tāšīm : "When he makes his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, etc." See also my recent study of this preformative $t-$ in *Orientalia* 48 (1979) 97-106.

(9) Consult the qtl - $yqtl$ sequence referring to the past in the Psalter as documented in M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (AB 17a; Garden City, N. Y. 1970) 420-422.

(10) The Massoretic unfamiliarity with the suffixed conjunction wn , with affirmative $-n$ attested in Ugaritic (*UT*, § 12.9), may account for the anomalous reading w'nē'sā'er instead of wān 'eššā'er 'ānī "and I alone was left", in Ezek 9,8. See *Bib* 62 (1981) 276, and my remarks there. A similar wrong division of words may be responsible for the difficulties in Prov 24,12 where MT $\text{w'nōšēr napšēkā hū' yedā}$ "and the guardian of your soul — he knows", is preferably

the presence of the *maqgeph* between 'im and *tāsīm* in vs. 10 has induced scholars to treat 'im as the conditional particle instead of the divine epithet that restores balance and sense to the verse.

† Mitchell DAHOOD

read *wān šar napšēkā hū' yēdā'*, "And the anguish of your soul he knows indeed"; this reading provides the desired accusative object of *yēdā'*. Once consonantal *wnšr* is divided into *wn šr*, vs. 12b is seen to resume vs. 10 which mentions both feminine *šārāh* and masculine *šar*, "anguish". With the recovery of *šar napšēkā* one has the semantic equivalent of Job 7,11 *šar rūhī*, "the anguish of my spirit", and a variation of Gen 42,21 *šārat napšō*, "the anguish of his soul".

RECENSIONES

Varia

Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Vol. II: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Edited by Menahem STERN. xvii-690 p. 24 x 15. Jerusalem 1980. The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Diffusion: E. J. Brill, Leiden.

Les pages consacrées à ce "nouveau corpus gréco-latin sur le judaïsme" (Biblica, 56, 1975, 251-253) nous dispensent de redire les mérites du recueil. Le t. II s'ouvre sur Tacite, traité avec ampleur (p. 1-93); le commentaire d'*Hist.* V, 1-13 (n° 281) occupe les pages 31-63. Viennent ensuite Juvenal, Suétone, Florus. Les auteurs grecs reparaissent avec Apollodore de Damas (*Poliorcétique*, n° 322), Herennius, Philon de Byblos (nos 323-329), Claude Ptolémée, Vettius Valens, Appien (nos 343-352), Pausanias (nos 353-360), Numénios (nos 363-369; ce dernier n°, mon fragment 13, garde le texte traditionnel ὁ γέν γε ὦν, qui fait allusion à l'Exode, 3, 14, et que défendent encore J. Whittaker [*Phoenix*, 32, 1978, p. 144-153] et H. A. S. Tarrant [*Antichthon*, 13, 1979, p. 19-29]), Aelius Aristide, Lucien, Celse (n° 375, p. 224-305: extraits du *Contre Celse* d'Origène, largement commentés).

Contemporain du *Discours vrai* de Celse, le *De usu partium* de Galien (n° 376) critique la cosmogonie mosaïque; tout le chapitre (p. 306-328) cite bien d'autres textes. Après la *Clé des songes* d'Artémidore et la *Vie d'Apolonius* de Philostrate (nos 402-404), voici l'*Histoire romaine* de Dion Cassius (p. 347-407), qui relate en détail la révolte juive sous Hadrien et la fondation d'Aelia Capitolina (cf. le commentaire des p. 393-405). Porphyre (p. 423-483), témoin sympathique dans la *Philosophie tirée des oracles*, le *De abstinentia*, la *Vie de Pythagore*, se montre hostile dans les fragments de l'*Adversus christianos*, bien commentés p. 425-428 et cités *in extenso* aux nos 458-465; il est douteux que les deux extraits du *De mysteriis* de Jamblique, II 3 et VII 4, se rapportent aux Juifs (p. 484-485).

Parallèle à l'*Adversus christianos* de Porphyre, le *Contra Galilaeos* de Julien fournit l'important n° 481a, traduit et commenté p. 513-548 (cf. déjà p. 502-505); comme la *Lettre à la communauté juive* (n° 486a, p. 559-568). Autres auteurs largement cités: Libanius (p. 580-599), Ammien Marcellin (p. 600-611), les biographes de l'*histoire Auguste* (p. 612-642) et le néoplatonicien Damascius (début du VI^e siècle) pour sa *Vie d'Isidore* (p. 671-679).

Un troisième volume doit comprendre appendice et index; on l'attendra avec impatience, pour exploiter plus facilement cette mine d'informations précieuses.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Édouard DES PLACES

Anthony C. THISELTON, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein*. xx-484 p. 24x16,5. Exeter 1980. Paternoster Press. £15.00.

Biblical hermeneutics in the last three decades has been dominated by Bultmann's demythologization programme. The application of Heidegger's philosophy to New Testament doctrine to make it relevant for today has given rise to hundreds of books and articles which not only deal with the pros and cons of existential interpretation but which imitate Bultmann in trying to explain the bible through the pre-understanding of other contemporary philosophies: apart from the later Heidegger, Gadamer, Freud, Marxism, logical positivism, structuralism and process philosophy. The existential philosophical trend underlying the theology of Bultmann and Fuchs / Ebeling has been studied thoroughly by R. E. Palmer in his book *Hermeneutics* (Evanston 1969), which has become a classical work on the subject. It would seem that there was very little to write after Palmer, but Thiselton's book is certainly destined to become another classic. The author literally takes to pieces Bultmannian and post-Bultmannian hermeneutics examining its philosophical and theological presuppositions and offering a critique from the point of view of a believing Christian. Had this been his only contribution, the book would be valuable as a well written *summa* of much that has been said before with a few precious new insights. But the most interesting section of the book is the last two chapters in which Thiselton discusses the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophische Untersuchungen* and its relevance to biblical hermeneutics. Wittgenstein is no existentialist of course, but his philosophy of language has points of contact with the later Heidegger and with structuralism which Thiselton considers to be useful as an integration of earlier studies. It is this part of the book which I wish to take up for discussion.

It is well known that Wittgenstein revised, or even rejected, the theory of language which he had exposed in his *Tractatus*. There he had taught that the world is made up of facts, the existence of states of affairs, that thought was a logical picture of these facts, and that a thought is a proposition with a sense. Propositions are models of reality, with the possibility or not of corresponding with the facts. What cannot be said must be passed over in

silence. This does not mean however, that what cannot be said has no reality or existence. In fact what can be shown cannot be said, it makes itself manifest, it is mystical. Among propositions there are those that lack sense (*sinnlos*), e. g. tautologies and contradictions, and others that are nonsensical (*unsinnig*). The former category do not provide information but understanding, and many propositions in the *Tractatus* belong to it. Like Heidegger, Wittgenstein shows astonishment and wonder that anything exists, and there is an analogy between the former's "saying" in primal language in the sense that it is a non-objectifying "letting be seen", and the latter's "showing" of "the mystical", not in but through language. In the later Wittgenstein the notion of how language shows what is already there, is developed in terms of "grammatical" utterances (pp. 362-370).

The central idea of the *Untersuchungen*, as opposed to the *Tractatus*, is the description of language as a game. As there is no common definition of "games" but only resemblances and differences, each one following its own rules and consisting in relationships between players among themselves and between the pieces they are playing with, so words can only mean anything in the stream of language-games and can change meaning when situations change. The transference of meaning from one language-game to another can create error or misunderstanding, as the same word can have two quite distinct meanings in different contexts. Wittgenstein's aim is to allow what is already there to be "seen" from the appropriate angle of vision. It is a call back to common sense which alone can disentangle so many misunderstandings in philosophical language and errors in thought caused by a confusion of language-games. This outlook has definite implications for hermeneutics which Thiselton sums up as follows: "We have now observed at least four points of connection between Wittgenstein's later writings and the hermeneutical problem. First of all, he is concerned to open up a perspective which allows us to notice what was already there to be seen. Secondly, he is concerned not with the generalities of formal logic, but with the particularities of specific language-situations, which may bring about changes in concepts. Thirdly, language-games are grounded in human life and human activities, which are open-ended towards the future and may therefore undergo temporal or historical change. Fourthly, there is no logical *a priori* behind training and upbringing in human life which places us in the situations in which we employ language. This comes near to Heidegger's belief that the world of Dasein is something prior to subject-object thinking and to cognitive propositions. Indeed, although Wittgenstein's notion of language-games is not identical with Heidegger's notion of worldhood, it has become clear that there are close parallels between the two concepts" (p. 378).

Following Wittgenstein's principle that grammatical remarks do not have the function of giving information about a state of affairs, but of elucidating the logical grammar of a concept, Thiselton goes on to apply this philosophy of language to exegesis. He distinguishes three classes of propositions which he illustrates by means of quotations from Paul's letters. To the first class belong universal analytical propositions, in which the predicate is nothing else but an elucidation of the subject, e.g. "every rod has a length". In Rom 11,6 Paul writes: "If it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works;

otherwise grace would no longer be grace". To this he adds Rom 4,4; 8,24; 1 Cor 13,10; Gal 3,20 etc. What is the function of such self-evident statements? It "is not to give fresh information, but simply to expand the horizons of the reader's *understanding*. In this sense they are *hermeneutical*. However, the purpose of noting these examples is not only to list occurrences of a certain type of statement; it is also to mark off this particular type of grammatical utterance from other types, with a view to suggesting certain conclusions about their setting" (p. 392). The second class includes propositions which are not universal because analytical but can be considered as hinge propositions which belong to a given culture. Within this culture the contrary proposition would be absurd, and so the argument touches rock-bottom; e.g.: "But if our wickedness serves to show the justice of God, what shall we say? That God is unjust to inflict wrath on us? (I speak in a human way). By no means! For then how could God judge the world?" (Rom 3,5f; cf. also 9,14-24; 8,7f; 1Cor 12,3; etc). Again, Thiselton does not provide these examples for their own sake but as illustrative of a different concept of form-criticism: "The present inquiry differs from normal form-critical procedure in at least one important respect. Instead of determining form in terms of what Wittgenstein would call the physical properties of language, we are attempting to classify forms on the basis of their logical function. This is not to abandon form-critical method, but to try to make it less arbitrary and more soundly based, since the actual physical properties of a stretch of language are more likely to have been determined by accidental factors than would be the case with logical function" (p. 396). "If this form-critical analysis is correct, two consequences follow. First of all claims about the place of reason in Paul should be modified to give due regard to the role of Pauline language in extending or clarifying concepts for *understanding*... secondly, if even some of our examples hold, we need to be hesitant about describing *all* assumptions which lie apart from the route travelled by inquiry as necessarily being *culture*-relative rather than as belonging to a given *theological* tradition" (p. 400f). At this point Thiselton passes on to consider a third kind of proposition, similar to the first but differing from it in so far as the predicate is not merely a tautology of the subject but its hermeneutical explanation. In Gal 3,29 Paul writes: "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise". This is a new definition of "Abraham's offspring" which the Jews would certainly not have accepted. It means that the true Jew is the Christian! "The picture and the grammar which it suggests 'commits us to a particular way of looking at the matter'. It is only by breaking the spell of a misleading picture that Wittgenstein can 'show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle'. As he puts it in *The Blue Book*, although 'a new notation' changes no facts, we may be 'irresistibly attracted or repelled by a notation... A change of names... may mean a great deal'" (p. 404).

The author's hermeneutical gleanings from Wittgenstein do not stop here. He has two other considerations to make. The first one is that of polymorphic concepts, i.e. the same word that can have different meanings in a variety of contexts, which he exemplifies by means of the word *sarx* in Paul and that of "truth", a concept which has given rise to many discussions

relative to the difference between Greek and Hebrew thought: "The truth of the matter is not that the Hebrews had a special concept of truth but that they employed the concept in certain contexts or language-games more frequently than these language-games were used in Greek literature. But the same language-games *could* be employed in both traditions" (p. 414). The second consideration, which our author applies theologically to a clarification of the problem of justification in Paul and James, makes use of Wittgenstein's theory of "seeing as": "We see a puzzle picture at first as a jumble of lines. Then suddenly *we provide a certain context*, and the lines portray a landscape. Only the person who knows the *system* of representation in radio circuitry can see the diagram as that of a radio receiver" (p. 418).

We have summarized at some length Thiselton's treatment of Wittgenstein both because of its originality and because it should provide the spring-board for our evaluation. It is clear that the application of the philosophy of the *Tractatus* and the *Untersuchungen* to biblical hermeneutics will not cause a revolution in hermeneutics — nor for that matter was this foreseen by our author — but it is a substantial contribution to the understanding of the text in so far as it is a summons to the common sense of logic, or rather, to the logic of common sense. One may wonder what difference it will make to the exegete whether a proposition belongs to the first, second, or third class of Thiselton's statements, but then one may well argue that it makes the same difference as knowing that within the structure of a sentence one word is a verb and another is a pronoun; that is, just as classifying words within a sentence is necessary to indicate the *function* of that word as related to other words, classifications of propositions is necessary to discover the function of certain affirmations within a text which might otherwise seem superfluous. The examples adduced by the author from Paul's letters amply prove this point. Paul uses language in such a way that his readers, those especially who are coming from Judaism, can perceive what is already there, or can be helped to look at it from the right perspective to recognize its evidence. The third class of statements especially helps towards the understanding of Paul's exegesis of the Old Testament. The apostle's way of reasoning has often baffled scholars, and that too because we are unfamiliar with rabbinic logic. It is hoped that this and similar studies will help us to perceive more biblical truths which are hidden only because we do not know how to look at them.

However, the reader who follows Thiselton's chapters on Wittgenstein remains a little dismayed that the argument is not carried through to the end. The author's treatment of the subject is certainly a contribution to exegesis, but is it equally valuable to hermeneutics? That is, does it help us to bridge the gap of temporal distance between ourselves and Paul to make his letters relevant to us living in the twentieth century? Thiselton shows that he has the key in his hands when he writes: "This means that the biblical text comes alive as a 'speech-act' (Cf. Heidegger's 'language-event') when some kind of correspondence or inter-relation occurs between the situation addressed by the biblical writer and the situation of the modern reader or hearer" (p. 436). Unfortunately this concept is not developed. It is precisely in the notion of meaning as a series of language-games that hermeneutics

can take place. One of St. Paul's key expressions is "freedom". He uses this word polymorphically in a series of language-games always within a religious context. So do his adversaries. The identification of these contexts and games will give us the exact senses of the word in first century Christianity. The word is also in common use today when a contamination of the religious context with the political one gives rise to a "Theology of liberation". Is our language-game legitimate? Can Wittgenstein's rules help us to discern whether it is played according to the proper rules? According to this philosopher there is no common definition of "game", there are only family resemblances and dissimilarities. This anti-essentialism (or nominalism?) can be very perilous because if we push it to the extreme and apply it to today's faith we can never be sure whether our faith is the *same* as that of St. Paul, or whether Christianity is a univocal concept or not. In my opinion the theory of language-games is very well detachable from Wittgenstein's anti-essentialism and can contribute as such to the hermeneutical problem as long as we do not fall into Wittgenstein's own trap of confusing metaphor with reality when we speak of language as a "game" and try to apply too literally to language-situations — changes in "players", in "pieces", in "rules" etc. — what we talk about in games. For example, who determines the "rules of the game" in religious language? Can we say: "Liberation theology is not acceptable because it is not a game which is being played according to traditional rules?" What value has tradition in establishing such rules and what authority does it possess? Does the Church have any authority as umpire to see whether the game is being played according to rule? If we were to accept Wittgenstein's philosophy, even partially, these are the problems we would have to grapple with in a hermeneutical context, and Thiselton may well help us to develop these ideas as long as he keeps in mind that even the various confessions have their own language-games which have to be disentangled to become useful in an ecumenical theological discussion. We look forward to the author's next publication.

Via del Sant'Uffizio, 25
00193 Roma

Prosper GRECH, OSA.

The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Cartonage. Published under the Auspices of the Dept. of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt, in Conjunction with the UNESCO. XXIII p. — 72 Plates 33,5 × 24,5. Leiden 1980. E. J. Brill. 180 Gld.

Mit dem vorliegenden Kartonage-Band ist die Faksimile-Edition der Nag-Hammadi-Handschriften noch nicht abgeschlossen. Da der Umfang der (beschriebenen) Papyri aus der Kartonage der erhaltenen Einbände weit grö-

Ber war, als man zunächst vermutet hatte, wurden diese nun getrennt von der allgemeinen Einleitung (die auch die Addenda und Corrigenda bringen wird) veröffentlicht, während für die Einleitung noch ein weiterer Band vorgesehen ist.

Die beschriftete Kartonage selbst ist hier auf dieselbe Weise zugänglich gemacht wie der Text der Handschriften in den übrigen Bänden, nämlich als Faksimileausgabe. Acht Seiten Einleitung (engl. Fassung) geben wichtige Informationen dazu und auch sonst interessante Hinweise und Folgerungen (etwa zur antiken Buchtechnik). Mit der Bearbeitung der hier im Faksimile veröffentlichten griechischen und koptischen Texte sind John W. Barns (†), Gerald M. Browne und John Shelton betraut; die Veröffentlichung soll in den Nag Hammadi Studies erfolgen. Einen Preliminary Report hatte Barns schon in der Labib-Festschrift (Nag Hammadi Studies 6) 9-17 gegeben (mit "Comment" von E. G. Turner S. 17 f.), aber nach der Einleitung unseres Bandes ist zu erwarten, daß die in Aussicht stehende Bearbeitung hier manches revidieren wird.

Die Bedeutung der aus den Einbänden der Nag-Hammadi-Handschriften gewonnenen Kartonage ist vielfältig, und die verschiedenen Aspekte brauchen hier nicht alle auch nur erwähnt zu werden. Auf zusätzliche Kenntnis des antiken Buchwesens wurde schon angespielt. Was die Nag-Hammadi-Texte selbst betrifft, so ergeben sich äußerst wichtige Anhaltspunkte für die Herkunft der Handschriften, sowohl zeitlich als auch lokal. Die Kartonage scheint, soweit Datierung bisher möglich war, ziemlich genau die erste Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts zu decken. Viele Einzelheiten zeigen, daß die Handschriften auch etwa in der Gegend entstanden sein müssen, wo sie nun vor wenigen Jahrzehnten gefunden wurden. Für die Bibelwissenschaft von besonderem Interesse sind die Nummern 89-93 aus Kodex 7 (Taf. 47-50) mit Fragmenten aus Gen 32 und 42 im sahidischen Dialekt. Diese Texte sind schon seit einigen Jahren veröffentlicht (R. Kasser in *Le Muséon* 85 [1972] 65-89), aber bei so alten Bibelfragmenten ist es nur zu begrüßen, wenn sie zusätzlich im Faksimile zugänglich sind. Diskussion wird es wohl noch um die Frage geben, ob sich von den Dokumenten einige auf die pachomianischen Klöster oder gar Pachom selbst beziehen. Gegebenenfalls wäre nicht nur interessante Information aus erster Hand über das älteste christliche Mönchtum gewonnen, nicht minder brennend ist die schon mehrfach angeschnittene Frage, ob die Nag-Hammadi-Texte selbst in irgendeiner Weise mit den Klöstern Pachoms in Verbindung zu bringen sind.

Pont. Ist. Biblico
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma

H. QUECKE

Marka STAROWIEYSKIEGO, *Ewangelie Apokryficzne* (Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu 1) Vol. 1-2. 756 p. 14,1 × 17. Lublin 1980. Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. zł 490.

Das Werk verspricht ein polnisches Gegenstück zum Hennecke-Schneemelcher zu werden. Erschienen ist gerade der erste Band; er besteht aus zwei Teilen (mit durchgehender Paginierung) und enthält die apokryphen Evangelien. Nach der allgemeinen Einleitung wird im 1. Abschnitt die "Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons" behandelt. Darauf folgt, in mehrere Abschnitte nach bestimmten Gruppen gegliedert, die polnische Übersetzung der apokryphen Evangelien, jeweils mit einer speziellen Einleitung und einem Kommentar. Dieser steht im Apparat, der außerdem wichtige Varianten bringt und die biblischen Zitate und Anspielungen ausweist. Eine Art Anhang bilden die Seiten 590-598 ("Die Apokryphen in der Kunst"), wo die 79 beigegebenen Abbildungen kurz vorgestellt werden. Auf über 100 Seiten folgt dann ein systematisch geordnete Bibliographie, die "so umfassend wie nur möglich" sein soll (S. 23). Indizes der Schriftstellen und der geographischen und Personennamen schließen den Band ab. Das imponierende Werk setzt sich aus Beiträgen von vierzehn Autoren zusammen (fünfzehn mit dem im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz umgekommenen G. Peradze, dessen Übersetzung eines georgischen Textes [in überarbeiteter Form] übernommen wurde), und die Verantwortlichkeit der Mitarbeiter für die einzelnen Partien ist jeweils genau ausgewiesen. Die Übersetzungen sind nach den Originalsprachen angefertigt (auch orientalischen); einige Ausnahmen sind wieder genau gekennzeichnet (zusammenfassend S. 22).

Vergleicht man die übersetzten Texte mit denen bei Hennecke-Schneemelcher, so ergeben sich hauptsächlich zwei Unterschiede. Das polnische Werk hat mehr jüngere (und sekundäre) Apokryphen aufgenommen, dagegen die Texte der eigentlich gnostischen Handschriften (Nag Hammadi ebenso wie der anderen) fast völlig ausgeschlossen. Von diesen sind nur das Thomasevangelium (vollständig) und das Philippusevangelium (auszugsweise) aufgenommen. Mir persönlich scheint der Ausschluß der gnostischen "Evangelien" ("und verwandter Dokumente", wie sie bei Hennecke-Schneemelcher genannt werden) vollauf gerechtfertigt, mag es vielleicht auch schwierig sein, ihn theoretisch zu begründen (vgl. die Erörterung S. 121). Es sind nun einmal zwei verschiedene Welten, die uns in den Apokryphen normalen Typs und in den gnostischen Texten begegnen. Seinen Niederschlag hat dieser Tatbestand auch in dem ganz verschiedenen äußeren Schicksal gefunden. Die Schriften, die wir herkömmlicherweise Apokryphen (des NT) nennen, haben immer in irgendeinem Kontakt zu kirchlichen Kreisen gestanden und dementsprechend eine kontinuierliche Überlieferung und ein ständiges Wachstum gekannt, während die gnostischen Texte nicht zufällig ganz früh untergegangen sind und erst wieder von der modernen Forschung ans Licht gezogen werden mußten. Wünschen würde ich, daß die weitere Arbeit von noch engerem Kontakt mit Kennern der orientalischen Sprachen profitieren kann. In der Bibliographie wäre vieles zu straffen, zu präzisieren und zu vereinheitlichen. S. 675 f. sind

die Arbeiten von Ehlers und Quispel zu streichen; sie beziehen sich nicht auf die Kindheiterzählung des Thomas, sondern auf das Thomasevangelium von Nag Hammadi. Grundsätzlich würde ich empfehlen, daß bei allen Werken mit größerem Umfang jeweils die Seiten genannt werden, auf denen die gemeinten Texte oder Angaben stehen. Verweise wie die von S. 678 und 700 auf Zoegas Catalogus haben wenig Sinn. Im zweiten Fall (assumptionistische Texte) ist bei Zoega über die Titel hinaus gar kein Text wiedergegeben, und die gemeinten Angaben über die Handschriften wären ohne Heranziehung weiterer Literatur nur mit größter Mühe zu finden. Umgekehrt gibt es eine ganze Reihe von publizierten Fragmenten, die nur indirekt genannt sind, nämlich aus der angegebenen Literatur zusammengesucht werden müssen. Auf derselben Seite sind bei den armenischen Texten mit den Nummern 646 ff. der Bibl. Hag. Or. Texte genannt, die gar nicht hierher gehören. Dieses in mehreren Versionen vorliegende "Gesicht" Mariens sollte in einem späteren Band bei den apokalyptischen Texten berücksichtigt werden.

Päpstliches Bibelinstitut
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

H. QUECKE

Vetus Testamentum

Abraham TAL, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, edited by Aron DOTAN, volume IV). 399 pages; introduction en hébreu (pp. VII-XX) et en anglais (pp. v-XIII). Tel-Aviv 1980. Tel-Aviv University.

On assiste, depuis quelques années, à un renouveau d'intérêt pour les études samaritaines (cf. R. Pummer, «The Present State of Samaritan Studies», *JSS* 21 [1976] 39-61; 22 [1977] 27-47; M. Mor, «More Bibliography on the Samaritans», *Henoch* 1 [1979] 99-122). Il reste pourtant beaucoup à faire et, en premier lieu, à produire de bonnes éditions des textes. Celle que nous offre A. Tal du *Targum samaritan* (TS) était très attendue. Z. Ben-Hayyim a montré (*BO* 23 [1966] 185) que TS est la pièce la plus ancienne de la littérature samaritaine, antérieure à la Liturgie et au *Memar Marqah* que J. Macdonald situe entre le II^e et le IV^e siècle (*Memar Marqah* [Berlin 1963], vol. I, p. xx) et Ben-Hayyim, pour des raisons linguistiques, au IV^e siècle. P. Kahle, d'autre part, considérait TS comme «one of the most important sources for the Aramaic spoken in Palestine in the first Christian centuries» (*The Cairo Geniza*² [Oxford 1959] 53).

TS est connu depuis que l'oratorien Jean Morin publia, dans la Polyglot-

te de Paris (1645), un manuscrit acheté à Damas en 1616 par Pietro della Valle (= Ms Vat. Sa. 2 = ms E de Tal). En 1657, son travail fut repris (avec des retouches) par E. Castle dans la Polyglotte de Londres de B. Walton dont les éditions postérieures de A. Brüll (1875) et M. Heidenheim (1884, *Genèse* seule) ne font que reproduire le texte. L'édition critique de J. H. Petermann — C. Vollers (1872-1893) repose sur une copie fabriquée exprès à Naplouse: mais, à l'insu des éditeurs, le copiste avait utilisé, tour à tour, à sa fantaisie, les mss A, B, C de la synagogue. Et c'est cette œuvre hybride qui fut munie d'un apparat tiré de plusieurs mss plus ou moins bons, et à nouveau de A, B, C!

Les travaux de P. Kahle et de ses élèves (cf. L. Goldberg, *Das samaritanische Pentateuchtargum. Eine Untersuchung seiner handschriftlichen Quellen* [Stuttgart 1935]) et, plus récemment en Israël, de Z. Ben-Hayyim permettaient d'espérer qu'il serait enfin remédié à cette situation. J. Ramón Díaz avait entrepris une édition critique du TS et préparé le livre de la *Genèse* pour sa dissertation (entre autres articles, cf. *EstBib* 15 [1956] 105-108, 297-300; 18 [1959] 171-197; *Encicl. de la Biblia* VI, 881-884). A. Tal, disciple de Ben-Hayyim, après une thèse remarquable (d'une «importance extraordinaire» écrit A. Díez Macho dans *BO* 36 [1979] 212) sur l'araméen du *Targum des Prophètes antérieurs* (cf. *Bib* 58 [1977] 114-117) était bien outillé pour publier une véritable édition du TS.

Pour juger le choix des mss de base et l'usage des autres témoins dans l'apparat, il nous faut attendre l'*Introduction* qui devrait, avec un *Glossaire* qui fait encore cruellement défaut, constituer le vol. III où l'auteur justifiera ses options. Il ne fournit ici que les informations strictement indispensables pour l'usage du livre et renvoie provisoirement à deux articles dont nous allons tenir compte (*JSS* 21 [1976] 26-38; *IsrOrSt* 8 [1978] 247 ss). L'édition nous paraît bien conçue et admirablement réalisée. Elle présente, sur une page, la recension de base fournie par le Ms Or 7562 du British Museum (sigle J, adopté par L. Goldberg) et, en regard, celle du ms 3 de la synagogue de Naplouse (sigle A, repris de Petermann). L'apparat critique concerne uniquement J et s'étend sur les deux pages, donnant les variantes des autres mss, ainsi que le témoignage du dictionnaire hébreu-arabe-samaritain *Hameliš*, selon l'édition de Ben-Hayyim (Jérusalem 1957) et du *Memar Marqah*, d'après celle de Macdonald. Le ms C («the best of all the Shechem MSS», dit Tal) est utilisé pour corriger J et en combler les lacunes. Il était considéré par Kahle et L. Goldberg comme le meilleur texte de base pour une édition critique (cf. J. Ramón Díaz, *EstBib* 18 [1959] 189-191). Un apparat succinct, auquel une flèche verticale renvoie dans le texte, indique pour J les corrections faites d'après C et, pour A, les leçons différentes du ms E. La division samaritaine en sections (*Qiššin*) est conservée, mais accompagnée de l'indication des chapitres et versets. D'autre part, beaucoup approuveront l'éditeur d'avoir adopté l'alphabet hébraïque au lieu des caractères typiquement samaritains (ce que Brüll avait déjà fait).

Les deux recensions publiées en synopse (J et A) représentent, selon Tal (*art. cit.*, 33-36), deux familles de manuscrits et deux périodes linguistiques différentes, fort éloignées l'une de l'autre dans le temps (*šty tqwpwt marwhqwt m'wd zw mzw*: p. VIII). J nous ramène au temps où l'araméen était encore

parlé et au début du développement du TS. La langue est proche de l'araméen plus ancien (cf. l'emploi de *hzy* (voir) et non de *hmy* qui est fréquent dans A ou de *qry* (appeler) au lieu de *s'q*) et le vocabulaire assez uniforme. A remonte aussi substantiellement (i.e. purifié des transformations ultérieures) à l'époque de l'araméen vivant (*art. cit.*, 38), mais dans son état actuel il est contemporain des textes liturgiques; il est très influencé par le grec et l'arabe et les divergences grammaticales par rapport à J sont multiples. Un processus d'actualisation y est aussi manifeste: *Ascalon* remplace *Gerar* à Gen 20,1,2; 26,1; les Philistins de 26,4 deviennent les *plystwn'y* et, à 48,22 Sichem est remplacé par *n'bls* (Nablus > Naplouse). Mais il serait fâcheux que les caractéristiques linguistiques de A fassent oublier que ce groupe plus tardif (mais aussi plus riche en interprétations originales: cf. 5,1,24; 9,6; 10,31; 17,22 etc.) peut avoir conservé des traditions anciennes. Ainsi à Gen 17,1; 43,14; 49,25 *El shadday* (simplement transcrit par J) devient *hywlh spwqh* dans A (et aussi E, non indiqué dans l'apparat); c'est l'interprétation midrashique (*še + day*, «qui se suffit») qui rend compte de *ikavōs* de la LXX (Job 21,15; Ruth 1,20.21) et d'Aquila (Ex 6,3). A Gen 14,9 Amraphel est appelé «roi de Babel» comme dans Onqelos (O), *Neofiti* (N) et *1 QGenAp* 21,23. Nous nous demandons si l'apparat, uniquement consacré à J, ne laisse pas passer des traditions intéressantes transmises par des recensions plus récentes.

Le vol. III d'*Introduction* tentera sans aucun doute d'éclairer nombre de problèmes. Et d'abord des problèmes linguistiques. Ben-Hayyim écrivait: «We are still very far from possessing exact knowledge of Samaritan Aramaic» (*art. cit.*, 186). Il faudra situer l'araméen du TS dans l'ensemble des dialectes araméens et en décrire l'évolution (à ce point de vue l'édition de J et A, situés aux deux points extrêmes de celle-ci, fournit un ample matériel de comparaison), préciser ses rapports avec l'araméen juif (de Judée et de Galilée), avec l'araméen de O (ou d'un proto-Onqelos?), le christo-palestinien et la langue de N et celle des fragments du Targum palestinien (TP) du Caire. A propos de ceux-ci, notons l'emploi de *hl'* (= *kî*) si fréquent dans TS, à Gen 4,7 et Deut 5,26 (dans P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens* II [Stuttgart 1930] 6,27). Des formes comme *ṭwwrh*, *ywwnh*, *lwwhy* (*ibid.* 15, 16, 58) et l'échange — *ww* > *b* signalé par H. L. Ginsberg (*Tarbiz* 5 [1934] 381) dans les textes du Caire sont illustrés par l'alternance fréquente (cf. Gen 14,6.14) *ṭwry* (A)/*ṭbry* (J) et *ṭwrh* / *ṭbrh* (*ṭwrh* > *ṭwwrh* > *ṭbrh*).

Il reste à étudier à nouveau l'histoire du TS, sa nature, son usage et ses relations avec la littérature targumique juive, étude à peine ébauchée par L. Goldberg. D'ordinaire le TS (dans tous les mss) suit de près le Pentateuque samaritain (dont nous n'avons pas encore malheureusement d'édition satisfaisante), avec ses transferts, ses inversions, ses répétitions, phénomènes qui recouvrent déjà des intentions exégétiques (cf. Ex 20,17 où l'on introduit Deut 18,18 ss). A. Tal (*art. cit.*, 32) présente TS comme «a word-for-word translation», la différence entre les mss consistant dans le choix de synonymes variés pour le même terme hébreu. C'est exact. Mais souvent le choix d'un terme implique une *interprétation* originale que le traducteur insère, avec encore plus de discrétion que O (cf. Gen 5,1,24; 9,20; 17,22; 23,18; 31,42; 38,14; 45,8; 49,8; Ex 3,5; 16,14; 24,10; 32,1.18 etc.).

Les traditions aggadiques, dans la littérature samaritaine, sont transmises surtout en dehors du Targum. Nous en avons relevé quelques-unes dans le *Memar Marqah*, parallèles aux traditions juives (*Bib* 46 [1965] 85). Mais le TS lui-même (dans ses diverses recensions) véhicule nombre d'interprétations semblables à celles des Targums palestiniens: son intérêt est loin d'être purement linguistique et il peut contribuer à dater ces exégèses anciennes, au moins de façon relative. Signalons quelques rapprochements qui méritent l'attention (comparer *Targum du Pentateuque, Genèse et Exode—Lévitique* [SC 245-256; Paris 1978, 1979]): *Gen* 1,2; 6,2; 12,6; 13,9; 14,6 (*Gabla* = Séir); 15,1; 17,9; 20,9 (J: *hwbb* au sens de péché); 21,33; 22,17 (*š' r* traduit par ville); 24,63 (la «prière» d'Isaac); 41,45 (J; sens du nom égyptien de Joseph: «qui révèle les choses cachées»; cf. Josèphe, *Ant.* II § 91); 43,18 (mss VBME: *lmtrbrbh*, «faire le prince»; cf. aussi Peshitta. Voir G. Vermes, «The Angel Sariel», *StJudLatAnt* 12,3 [1975] 159-166. A *Gen* 32,29 le ms A traduit *'trbrbt* comme le TP); 49,26 (*nzyr* interprété comme couronne); *Ex* 12,12.29 («frapper» rendu par «tuer»); 18,12 (anciens > sages: cf. N); 26,1.31 (chérubins > figures); 32,5 (la peur d'Aaron). Le nombre d'interprétations communes au TS et au TP en général est bien plus grand qu'il n'y paraît. Elles méritent que l'on utilise l'apparat de Tal comme source d'informations et non pas seulement pour évaluer la qualité de J. Derrière une unité de fond indéniable apparaissent nombre de divergences significatives pour l'histoire du TS (ou mieux, des traditions targumiques samaritaines).

Quelques remarques de détail. A, lacunaire au début (*Gen* 1—3; 6—10,6), a été complété par E qui, pour les vingt-sept premiers chapitres peut être considéré comme équivalent à A. Pour ce début, il convenait de doubler le sigle en haut de page: A(E). Le ms M, souvent utilisé dans l'apparat, contient de multiples citations d'Onqelos (cf. L. Goldberg, *op. cit.*, 28-34); ainsi à *Gen* 18,25; 41,44; 43,18; 44,20 etc. Mais l'apparat ne l'indique pas comme provenant de O, mais seulement comme variante marginale (m) de M. A, qui est publié tel quel (les dittographies seules étant éliminées) avec ses nombreuses interpolations et ses erreurs fournit un exemple de l'état linguistique réel d'un ms du TS. Mais plus d'un sera déconcerté par des formes insolites résistant à toute analyse. L'*Introduction* annoncée fournira sans doute quelques directives pour l'interprétation (en particulier, en ce qui concerne l'anarchie qui règne dans l'usage des gutturales). Nous n'avons relevé que de menues erreurs d'impression, comme p. 75 (pour *Gen* 22,5): lire *nhk*, au lieu de *nh*.

Nous attendrons avec impatience que l'entreprise s'achève et espérons que l'auteur fera généreusement part, dans son *Introduction*, des mille enseignements que la fréquentation de tant de textes targumiques juifs et samaritains aura apportés et, si possible, avec un ample résumé en anglais pour le profit d'un plus grand nombre de lecteurs.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

R. LE DÉAUT

F. I. ANDERSEN — D. N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, 24) 701 S. Garden City, New York 1980. Doubleday & Company. US \$ 14.

Die Anchor Bible hat einen wertvollen Band dazugewonnen. Der imponierende Umfang von 700 Seiten hätte sich kaum wesentlich reduzieren lassen, wenn etliche leere Seiten und das zweimalige Abdrucken der Übersetzung vermieden worden wären; denn eine gewisse Breite in der Darbietung war anscheinend beabsichtigt. Der Anspruch (und die Illusion), auch für Leser ohne "special formal training in biblical studies" geschrieben zu sein, wird in der äußeren Aufmachung u.a. noch durch elf fotografische Illustrationen unterstrichen. Die Wissenschaftlichkeit hat unter all dem nicht zu leiden. Auf den vollständigen Übersetzungstext (3-27), die Einleitung (31-77) und die Bibliographie (81-111) folgen unter Verzicht auf distinkte methodische Schritte 23 Auslegungseinheiten, denen die Übersetzung jeweils noch einmal vorangestellt wird. Die Großeinheiten Hos 1-3 (115-309) und Hos 4-14 (313-648) erhalten je eine zusätzliche längere Einleitung. Für die Erschließung durch Indices ist viel getan worden: Zusammenstellung der Bezugnahmen auf heidnische Götter (649-650), Autorenverzeichnis (651-654), sehr weitgehendes, fast pedantisches Sachverzeichnis (655-671), Liste der Wörter und Begriffe (673-682) und Stellenverzeichnis (683-699).

Zu den besonderen Vorzügen zählt der Rezensent zunächst die "konservative" Grundeinstellung. Die Auslegung dringt vom Sicherem zum weniger Sicherem vor und bekennt oft eine *ignorantia*, die das Attribut *docta* verdient und beim Hoseabuch dringend geboten ist. Zur Textbehandlung vergleiche man etwa die S. 59-60, 67 (oben) und 320-321 ausgesprochenen Grundsätze. Hoch veranschlagt werden die flächenhaften Strukturbeobachtungen, durch die sich der Kommentar einen festen Platz in der Forschung gesichert haben dürfte. Bei der Eigenart des Hoseabuches ist ihnen durchaus methodische Priorität zuzuerkennen. Sie werden der Einzelexegese in den jeweiligen Auslegungseinheiten vorausgeschickt und lassen nicht selten Streichungen, Umstellungen oder Änderungen unratsam erscheinen. (Das *Syllable Counting*, eine Spezialität früherer Beiträge von Freedman, wird in der Einleitung, S. 76-77, angekündigt, aber nachher so gehandhabt, daß m.E. nirgendwo Schaden entsteht.) Gegenüber den Strukturbeobachtungen am überlieferten Gebilde des Buches werden die Möglichkeiten der Formkritik, die zum Vorwitz bei der Abgrenzung von Einheiten und der Bestimmung des Sitzes im Leben verleitet, zurückhaltend beurteilt (vgl. S. 315). Sogar im Falle von 5,8 — 6,6, wo relativ gute Anhaltspunkte gegeben sind, bildet schließlich weder die politische Situation noch ein eventueller kultischer Hintergrund den eigentlichen Angelpunkt, um den sich die Auslegung dreht. Die Verfasser werden sich freilich die Frage gefallen lassen müssen, ob die Suche nach ursprünglichen Verkündigungseinheiten und deren Sitz im Leben nicht doch mehr Einsatz verdient. Es gibt ein berechtigtes Interesse an der historischen Erscheinungsform des Prophetentums, die sich ja nicht einfachhin mit der alttestamentlichen Interpretation deckt. Diesen Unterschied halten die Verfasser offenbar für

unerheblich; sie wännen sich im Hoseabuch dicht bei der historischen Prophetengestalt. Das ist wohl der tiefere Grund für ihre Abstinenz in der historischen Hinterfragung des Buches. Man sollte das eine tun und das andere nicht lassen. Grundsätzlich (nicht nur, weil es das einzig Mögliche zu sein scheint!) ist das Buch als solches auszulegen, was in diesem Kommentar geschieht; doch muß die Rekonstruktion der historischen Verkündigung des Propheten gleichfalls versucht werden, so wenig erfolgversprechend das Unternehmen auch sein mag.

Bewunderung verdient das ausführliche und vorsichtige Herausarbeiten der Wortbedeutungen und des Sprachgebrauchs. Als Beispiele seien genannt: *'ēšet z'nūnīm* in 1,2 (S. 157-167) (die Initiations-theorie wird abgelehnt), *lō' ruḥāmāh* (S. 187-188), die Erklärung von 1,6-7 (S. 188-197), der Weinbergsgabe in 2,17a (S. 272-275), von 3,3 (S. 300-305), von *mwr* in 4,7 (S. 355-358), von 4,9a (S. 359-361) und 8,1 (S. 485-486). Die Deutung des berühmten Sprichworts von 8,7 (S. 496-498) ("They will sow when it is windy, they will reap in a whirlwind") dürfte von allgemeinem Interesse sein. Sie stützt sich u.a. auf das typisch hoseanische Auslassen von Präpositionen. Der Kommentar ist auch dann bereichernd, wenn man — wie im Fall von 1,6-7 — anderer Auffassung ist.

Auf Grund ihres ausgeprägten Sinns für die Idiomatik des Hebräischen sind die Verfasser gegen unüberlegte Neudeutungen unter Berufung auf das Nordwestsemitische gefeit. Die Entscheidung wird meist in Auseinandersetzung mit M. Dahood und namentlich noch mit W. Kuhnigk, *Nordwestsemitische Studien zum Hoseabuch* (1974) getroffen. (Diese beiden Namen kommen im Autorenverzeichnis neben H. W. Wolff am häufigsten vor. Kuhnigk wurde von Andersen in *Bib* 57 [1976] 573-575, kritisch besprochen). So wird *hišbīt* in 1,4 (S. 182-183) in seiner normalen Bedeutung belassen; das masoretische *jahdāw* in 2,2 (S. 207-208) wird beibehalten; ein Vorschlag Dahoods (und Kuhnigks) zu *dāmīm* in 4,2 (S. 339) wird nicht angenommen; in *napsō* in 4,8b (S. 359) steckt keine alte Akkusativendung. Auffallend unkritisch sind die Verfasser jedoch gegenüber dem asseverativen (oder emphatischen) Kaph und Lamed bzw. *kī* und *l'* und gegenüber dem enklitischen Mem, als wären Zweifel und Fragen, auch grundsätzlicher Art, hier nicht mehr angebracht. Die Stellen findet man unter den betreffenden Buchstaben bzw. Vokabeln im Wörterverzeichnis (S. 677), wo man allerdings die Lameds von 4,10 (S. 363, Z. 13 v.u.) und 12,8b (S. 617, Z. 2) und das Kaph von 7,12a (S. 469, Z. 3 v.u.) vermißt. Nach ihrem sonstigen exegetischen Habitus dürften die Verfasser eigentlich kaum einen Fall gutheißen. Ein Unbehagen verspürt man auch angesichts des Dranges, verkappte Gottes und Götterbezeichnungen zu entdecken (vgl. die Aufstellung der Bezeichnungen für heidnische Götter S. 649-650). Nun gibt es im Hoseabuch sicher genügend zweifelsfreie Fälle. Dazu wird jedoch der "Resident of Samaria" in 10,5 eher nicht zu zählen sein (S. 556), auch nicht *'āl* als Jahwebezeichnung in 11,7 (S. 586-587) und, negativ gewendet, in 7,16 (S. 477-478). Im Falle von *tōb* in 8,3 (S. 491) und erst recht in 14,3 (S. 645) äußern sich die Verfasser selbst weniger dezidiert; es handelt sich eher um eine Vertragskategorie. Die Termini *'āwōn* (4,8; 5,5; 7,1; 10,10) und *ḥattāt* (4,8; 10,8; 13,12) wären besser aus dem Spiel geblieben. (Im Übersetzungstext von 14,7 wird "Glory" groß geschrieben, als wäre

es eine Gottesbezeichnung; hier ist eine ganz unschuldige Stelle in den Sog von 4,7; 9,11 und 10,5 hineingeraten).

Ein schwerwiegender Mangel, für den die Verfasser jedoch bewußt einstehen, ist m.E. die fast völlige Taubheit gegenüber der Stimme der exilisch-nachexilischen Heilsverkündigung. In der Einleitung ist zwar die Rede von sammelnden, bewahrenden, ordnenden und herausgebenden Schülern oder Nachfolgern und von der Sicht späterer Epochen (S. 52-53; vgl. S. 59). Dabei ist zunächst an die erste Hälfte des 7. Jahrhunderts gedacht, dann aber auch an das Exil (S. 55-57). Es soll sogar eingefügte Botschaft für die Verbannten geben und nicht leicht auszumachen sein, was der Exilsredaktion und was dem alten Prophetenbuch zuzuweisen ist. Doch besteht auch wieder kein Grund, Bearbeitungen von einiger Bedeutung anzunehmen (S. 57; vgl. S. 59). Hos 1-3 stammt, ohne daß Änderungen oder Hinzufügungen theoretisch ausgeschlossen würden, aus der Feder eines Hosea Nahestehenden, der in Hos 3 sogar eine autobiographische Schrift übernommen hat (S. 58). Auch in Hos 4-14 ist das Wort des Propheten im wesentlichen unangetastet geblieben (S. 59). In der Auslegung wird getan, als gäbe es die Redaktion nicht. Sogar eindeutige Texte wie 2,1-3 und 3,4-5 werden nicht bedacht, zumal sie organisch mit dem Vorausgehenden verbunden sind. Daß dieser Umstand wie auch die sprachliche Einheitlichkeit dazu nötigen könnte, die Hoseanität des Vorausgehenden anders zu bestimmen, ist kein Thema. Eine tiefgreifende Redaktion, die das Buch im Innersten affiziert und nicht mit ein paar Juda-Stellen zu verwechseln ist, kommt nicht in den Blick. Die Heilsverkündigung der Redaktion ist m.E. in ganz besonderer Weise in 11,1-11 gleichsam hineingegossen worden und hat in 11,10-11 sogar selbst das Wort ergriffen. Unter dieser Voraussetzung sind die jetzt futurische Heilsverkündigung von 11,4, das in 11,5 zuwege gebrachte Nicht-nach-Ägypten (eine deuteronomistische Parole!), die Bekehrung von 11,7 und dann natürlich 11,8-9 zu interpretieren. Das asseverative *l'* ist in 11,9 fehl am Platze; schon die Anwesenheit von *'āsûb* in 11,9b schließt es aus. Ganz klar spricht in 14,2-10 die exilisch-nachexilische Heilsverkündigung, nach bekanntem Schema am Ende des Buches oder von größeren Einheiten.

Die Deuteronomismen (vgl. S. 75; auch S. 131), insbesondere die mit dem deuteronomistisch redigierten Amosbuch verwandten Stellen und die historischen Anspielungen in Hos 12 (aber auch z.B. 9,10-11) als Spuren der Redaktion zu bewerten, liegt unserm Kommentar umso eher fern, als die Forschung auch sonst wenig Neigung in dieser Richtung zeigt. Hier wird die Wahrheitsfindung erst möglich sein, wenn die "älteren" Pentateuchquellen als relativ späte, die bereits abgelaufene Geschichte des Volkes erhellende Synthesen verstanden werden und das Deuteronomistische samt dem Deuteronomium seinen ausschließlichen Platz in der exilisch-nachexilischen Restauration erhält. Man wird einwenden, Hosea habe eine ältere, vorliterarische Jakob-Tradition gekannt und gehöre selbst zu den prophetischen Vorläufern der deuteronomistischen Literatur; also seien aus einer eventuellen Spätdatierung der Pentateuchquellen und des Deuteronomistischen keine Rückschlüsse auf die Datierung der historischen Anspielungen in Hos 12 und der Deuteronomismen des Hoseabuches zu ziehen. Darauf ist zu antworten, daß das Hoseabuch doch wohl aus den novellistisch gestalteten Jakob-Erzählungen der

Pentateuchquellen schöpft, die (als solche!) nicht aus älterer Tradition stammen, und daß die angeblich protodeuteronomistischen Elemente als solche ein Postulat sind, das die Aufrechterhaltung der fast vollständigen Authentie des Hoseabuches ermöglichen soll.

Wer den Riesenkommentar ganz gelesen hat, darf sich noch kritische Bemerkungen zu Einzelheiten erlauben. Der Versuch, die Personalpronomina *hēm māh* bzw. *hēm* in 2,14.24 ebenso wie in 2,6 auf die Kinder zu beziehen und entsprechend unter dem Geschenk der Liebhaber in 2,14 nicht Weinstöcke und Feigenbäume, sondern eben die Kinder zu verstehen, tut dem Text Gewalt an. Zur Argumentation ist u.a. festzustellen, daß sich das maskuline *hēm māh* in 2,14b sehr wohl auf *geben* und *te' ēnāh* in 2,14a beziehen kann (zu S. 252; vgl. Joüon, § 149c) und daß *wešamtiṁ* *le* in 2,14 nicht dieselbe Konstruktion aufweist wie *wešamtiḱā* *ke* in 2,5 (zu S. 255, Z. 3). — Es gibt keinen Anhaltspunkt dafür, daß die Form *'ehjeḥ* von Hos 1,9 (vgl. S. 198-199) jemals als Variante des Namens Jahwe existiert hat. Es wird sich wie in Ex 3,14 um etymologisches Spiel handeln. — Trotz der eindrucksvollen Argumentation der Verfasser (S. 188-197) scheint schon allein wegen des Tenors von 1,7b festzustehen, daß 1,7 vom Heil für Juda spricht. Das ist schon immer richtig empfunden worden; meistens wurde dabei die Juda-Stelle als Glosse ausgegeben. Mir scheint schon 1,6b positiv Erbarmen und Vergabung (der *Sensus obviu*s von *nāšā' le!*) auch für Israel zu beinhalten. Die masoretische Punctuation teilt dieses Verständnis und zeigt es an, indem sie *lō' 'ōsip* durch den *Rebiā'* abtrennt. Das asyndetische *'ārahēm* ist also nicht mit *lō' 'ōsip* zu verbinden. Die in dem Namen *lō' ruḥāmāh* liegende Drohung ist im jetzigen, letztlich ganz auf Heil abzielenden redaktionellen Textgefüge nicht weiter ausgeführt in 1,6b; vielmehr wird der Name sofort in Heil abgebogen. Wenn also die Erklärung des Namens *lō' ruḥāmāh* in 1,6-7 bereits Heilsverkündigung ist, wird verständlich, warum in der Heilsverkündigung von 2,1 nur *lō' 'ammī* verwendet wird. Der Passus 2,1 greift eben nur auf 1,8-9 zurück und bleibt im Bereich von *lō' 'ammī*, während 1,6-7 seine mit dem andern Namen operierende Heilsverkündigung schon in sich selbst trägt. Abschließend kommen dann alle drei Namen noch einmal zusammenfassend in 2,2-3 in Heilsbedeutung vor. — Bei der Erklärung der Wendung *'ālāh min hā' āreš* in 2,2 (S. 208-209) wird die Deutung "sich des Landes bemächtigen", die kein bloßer Vorschlag von H. W. Wolff ist, fast unterschlagen, und die einzige wirklich sachgemäße Vergleichsstelle Ex 1,10 kommt nicht richtig ins Bild (S. 209, Z. 4). Nicht zu billigen ist auch, daß Jisreel in 2,2 als Vokativ aufgefaßt wird (S. 210). Der "Tag Jisreels" ist in diesem Zusammenhang nicht mehr der Tag der Abrechnung mit dem Haus Jehus, sondern der Tag, an dem sich das in 2,2 Angekündigte verwirklicht. — Immer wieder wird mit einer respektablen exegetischen Tradition unterstellt, daß das ehebrecherische Treiben Gomers etwas mit dem Baalskult (wenn auch nicht in Form eines Initiationsritus) zu tun hat. Das ist eine unbewiesene Übertragung der einen Ebene (Baalskult Israels, der Ehefrau Jahwes) auf die andere (Untreue Gomers, der Ehefrau Hoseas). Die "Tage der Baale" in 2,15 beziehen sich auf Israel, nicht notwendigerweise auf die Ehefrau Hoseas. Im übrigen sind sich die Verfasser des Problems der beiden Ebenen in 2,4-25 bewußt (vgl. z.B. S. 262 unten). — Bei sonst zutreffender Deutung wird S.

284, Z. 2, vorausgesetzt, daß *jāda'* in sexueller Bedeutung mit weiblichem Subjekt nicht vorkommt. Man vergleiche jedoch Gen 19,8 und Ri 11,39. — Zu 4,7 (S. 354-355) hätten die *Tiqqunê sopherim* (aus *K'ôdî* und *hēmîrû*) wenigstens erwähnt oder sogar beachtet werden sollen. — In 4,14 (S. 369) ist eine dialektische Negation dem dubiosen und obendrein nicht ins Satzgefülle passen wollenden asseverativen *l'* immer noch vorzuziehen. — Auf S. 569, Z. 3 v.u., entsteht der Eindruck, daß H. W. Wolff die Erklärung von *derek* (10,13) aus dem ugaritischen *drkt* befürwortet. In der von mir benutzten 2. deutschen Auflage des Wolffschen Kommentars ist das Gegenteil der Fall. — Das Verbum *hārad* in 11,10-11 konnotiert hier weniger die Furcht als das Eilige, Beflissene (vgl. die semantische Skizze in J. Becker, *Gottesfurcht im AT* [1965] 10-11). — Unter den größeren Studien zu Hosea fehlt, vielleicht aus zeitlichen Gründen, F. Diedrich, *Die Anspielungen auf die Jakob-Tradition in Hosea 12,1 – 13,3* (FzB 27; Würzburg 1977), der S. 75 anzuführen wäre. Auf S. 69 wird die im Literaturverzeichnis stehende forschungsgeschichtliche Arbeit über Hoseas Ehe von S. Bitter (1975) nicht berücksichtigt.

Errata corrige: S. 37, Z. 11: Gal'azu; ebd. Z. 12: Magidū; S. 92: L. Dürr (fehlerhaft geschriebene Namen sind meist auch im Autorenregister nicht in Ordnung); S. 100: Junker H. 1960 (statt 1906); S. 101, Z. 2: *hpr* (statt *bhr*); S. 101: Kötting; S. 104: Östborn; S. 106: Schunck; S. 107: van Trigt; S. 123, Z. 14 (u. S. 164, Z. 8 v.u.): Hendriks; S. 307, Z. 11: I Kings 8,46-50 (statt 8,4-5); S. 352, Z. 24: Der angebliche Parallelismus von *dmh* und *šdd* in Jer 6,2 beruht wohl auf einer Verwechslung mit der zwei Zeilen vorher angeführten Stelle Jer 47,5 (vgl. 47,4); S. 414, Z. 4: Fitzmyer; S. 530, Z. 22: Jeremiah 42 (statt 52); S. 556, Z. 16: *bēhar* (statt *hēhar*); S. 675, Z. 2 v.u.: *khš* (statt *hhs*; unter "k" einzuordnen); S. 677, Z. 18: *yopyāpītā*; S. 678, Z. 2: wohl *ymnh* (statt *mynt*) oder *mny* 203. Der "honest effort not to be hedged in with thornbushes" (Vorwort) war mit Erfolg gekrönt, jedoch nicht bei den oft arg entstellten deutschen Titeln der Bibliographie.

Peter Damiaanstraat 38
6369 SV Simpelveld
Nederland

Joachim BECKER

Novum Testamentum

Albert VANHOYE, *Prêtres anciens, prêtre nouveau selon le Nouveau Testament*. (Parole de Dieu 20). 366 p. 20,5 × 14. Paris 1980. Éditions du Seuil.

Although footnotes in this book are few, it is a solidly exegetical work by a scholar who has a keen ability to get at the sense of a text. At the same time, it is a work containing many valuable theological insights by a man

sensitive to the issues of our times. A. Vanhoye begins with three solidly grounded chapters in which he surveys the features of priesthood as it was in Old Testament times and as it was in the first century A. D. He reminds us that the earliest Christian communities had no priesthood simply because they had become separated from the only legitimate priesthood provided for by the Law, but that their efforts "not to abolish the Law but to fulfill it" eventually produced those transformed concepts of priesthood found in late books of the New Testament: Heb, 1 Pet, and Rev. He then turns to the relevant passages in those books. In his masterly exposition of Heb he shows us the richness and the subtlety in that epistle's transformation of concepts of sacrifice and priesthood received from Jewish tradition in order to express soteriological realities. In his study of 1 Pet he shows how the glorified Christ conditions the Church as a priestly collectivity. In the Rev the priesthood of all Christians has to be understood in close connection with their royalty, worship being understood in relation to life, heavenly realities in relation to earthly history. In his conclusion, he traces the path which led from a Christian community without a priesthood of its own, through the development of a Christology (Heb) and an ecclesiology (1 Pet) in priestly terms, to a Church whose shepherds and leaders were priests, essentially different from Levitical priests, of course, but enjoying a certain type of relation to Christ the high priest and to His saving acts.

One does not predicate "priest" univocally of a Levitical priest, of Christ, of a Christian believer, of a ministerial priest: they are called priests in essentially different senses. But "priest" is not predicated of them equivocally, either; that would exclude those very aspectual similarities which make metaphor meaningful. A. Vanhoye eschews the use of the word "metaphor" (cf. p. 235, n. 66), but takes the expressive content of metaphor seriously. In his exegesis he ferrets out the similarities which permit the metaphoric transfer and then admirably unfolds the realities which the Biblical authors express in terms with a transferred sense. In his theological extension of some of the metaphorically expressed Biblical concepts he proceeds largely by analogical reasoning, a valid theological procedure. His extension of some of Heb's concepts of Christ the high priest and his saving acts (metaphorically, and meaningfully, expressed by Heb in terms of priesthood and sacrifice) to the situation of Christians and of a ministerial priesthood as it eventually evolved in the Church seems to be more cogent than his opening to ministerial priesthood what 1 Pt says about the Church as *ἱεράτευμα*. The main reason for that may lie in the rather pale use of *ἱεράτευμα* as a metaphor in 1 Pet itself. He notes (pp. 297-299) that in 1 Pet 5,1-4 *πρεσβύτεροι* are told to be shepherds *ἐπισκοποῦντες* their flock, and he sees them participating in the special relation which Christ has to the flock, since Christ is Himself called shepherd and *ἐπίσκοπος* in 2,25 — a good conclusion drawn by analogy and based on the double use of a strong metaphor in 1 Pet itself. But then, because of the analogies which he sees between 5,1-4 and 2,4-10 (initial evocations of Christ's suffering and glory, the flock of 5,2 = the house for a priestly functioning of 2,5), he concludes that 1 Pet furnishes elements putting us on the path towards a priestly understanding of the role of *πρεσβύτεροι* as priests enjoying a special relation to Christ as media-

tor. Here, the analogical reasoning is not particularly cogent, because the mixed metaphors of 1 Pet 2,4-10 are too weak to support it adequately. Unlike the metaphor of the shepherd and the flock, aptly applied both to the *πρεσβύτεροι* and to Christ, the metaphor of the cornerstone (= Christ) and the house (= Church) in 2,5-8 does not in itself bear extension to *πρεσβύτεροι*, and the weaker metaphor of royal priesthood in 2,9-10 does not of itself provide for the relation of either Christ or a particular group to the Church.

But not all metaphorical language in the Biblical texts is as casual as that of 1 Pet 2,4-10, and the theologian can use different species of analogy. In much of what A. Vanhoye does in relating Biblical concepts of priesthood or sacrifice to realities in the Church he is actually using that kind of analogical thinking, known well to the best of the Schoolmen, in which what is predicated of one thing properly is predicated of others improperly, but nevertheless validly because between them and the proper analogate some relation of cause or sign is seen. He has used that kind of analogical reasoning when he writes, for example, of ministerial priests as "living instruments of Christ the mediator . . . manifesting the active presence of Christ the mediator . . . in the life of believers, so that the latter can explicitly receive that mediation and, in virtue of it, transform their entire existence" (pp. 346-347). Implicitly, the proper analogates are no longer those of Levitical priesthood and sacrifice but those of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. To describe the procedure in Neo-Platonic terms: we are shown ministerial priests as *εἰκόνες* of Christ the high priest in Heb, visible and tangible signs, effective manifestations here and now of those transcendental soteriological realities accomplished in the past which the author of Heb has expressed in transferred cultic language. This type of theological reasoning is one of the memorable features of the book.

Throughout the work one notices A. Vanhoye's professional competence, his depth, the clarity of his thought and of his exposition. He is intelligently and solidly committed to the Church. Since the book is not presented as a strictly exegetical monograph, I should like to close with a reminder to exegetes that it contains a great deal of valuable and fresh exegetical interpretation, especially of Heb, of whose interpretation A. Vanhoye is recognized as a master.

St. Meinrad Archabbey
St. Meinrad, IN 47577
U.S.A.

Aelred Cody

Halvor MOXNES, *Theology in Conflict. Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum LII). XIV — 319 pags. 24,5x16. Leiden 1980. E. J. Brill.

El subtítulo de esta obra sugiere un propósito ambicioso y hace concebir al lector expectativas quizás demasiado grandes. Al final de la lectura quedan reducidos uno y otras a sus dimensiones más auténticas y modestas.

La obra se enfrenta con varios textos de Rom., cuyo punto común es el hablar de Dios en un contexto de controversia, particularmente con judíos, aunque también con gentiles. Tales textos son Rom 4,13-22, tratado más largamente y otros más breves de los capítulos 1-5 y 9-11 de la misma carta.

La intuición de M. es partir de una situación influenciada por factores concretos. La concepción sobre Dios surge, no «a priori», desde «arriba» o únicamente de forma abstracta; está influida por *nuestras* preguntas y concepciones, que pueden coincidir, o no, con las de los autores bíblicos y, concretamente con las de Pablo (pags. 5-9). Tal intuición permite un conocimiento del texto más cercano a la realidad en la cual surgió. En este campo, como en otros del NT, la integración de ciencias como la sociología del lenguaje puede producir avances. Así procede el autor, por ejemplo, en las pags. 65-69 y 88. Ello es un mérito. Y a este propósito sorprende que no haya considerado la obra de G. Theissen, *Soziologie der Jesubewegung*.

El problema es, si para la concepción paulina de Dios en Rom. el contexto histórico-social de su polémica en esta carta (¡si es que puede hablarse de polémica en ella!) es tan decisivo o ha sido tan poco atendido hasta ahora como para merecer una obra «a se». Se tiene la impresión de que la unidad formal obtenida por este enfoque no es muy grande ni los resultados son sorprendentes. Por ejemplo, M. critica la conocida frase de Bultmann de que en teología paulina hablar de Dios es hablar del hombre y afirma que «para Pablo hablar de Dios es hablar de su pueblo» (p. 99). En realidad no es tan distinto. Después de todo los escritores bíblicos, y Pablo en particular, suelen pensar más colectiva que individualmente. Esto lo sabía Bultmann cuando escribía la frase citada.

Es aceptable una de las tesis principales del libro: Pablo usa el lenguaje de Dios, extraído en gran parte de formulaciones tradicionales (p. 31), en orden a superar las diferencias entre cristianos de origen judío y no judío (pags. 97, 283, 288...), para aclarar la identidad de estos grupos y defender la propia praxis misional, orientada en esta línea, argumentando a sus oponentes judíos con sus propias expresiones e ideas sobre Dios, aunque entendidas a la luz de Cristo (283-285).

También resultan válidas y útiles las consecuencias de esta tesis: cómo Pablo no separa teoría y praxis, ni hace un discurso abstracto sobre Dios, sino lo integra en un mundo real, su mundo, con los conflictos reales entre los hombres contemporáneos, procurando superarlos desde dentro.

Sin embargo no resulta tan claro que esa sea la característica fundamental del lenguaje de Dios en Rom. «Most of Paul's statements about God in Roman were related to the situation in which he attempted to achieve unity

through conflict» (288), a no ser que restrinjamos el lenguaje acerca de Dios a determinados pasajes, prácticamente los señalados por el autor. Pero, ¿no es reducir excesivamente el campo? Un caso: la explicación de Moxnes sobre Rom 4,5 diciendo que de este modo Pablo no sólo identifica al Dios de Abraham con una predicación cristiana, sino además apela a una fórmula tradicional aceptable a todos los cristianos, cualquiera que fuera su origen (43-45), parece ligeramente corta. Aceptando su punto de vista, ha de reconocerse que las palabras paulinas van más allá, apuntan a una caracterización de Dios válida aun en contextos no polémicos o de diferencias entre grupos. Dios justifica gratuitamente al impío. Lo cual es tan propio de Dios e imposible al hombre como la propia obra de la creación (cfr. Rom 3,26; 4,17; cfr. Käsemann, *Römerbrief*, 86, 88, 116).

Para no multiplicar ejemplos, esta es la objeción más general que suscita este libro: no ir al fondo de la doctrina paulina sobre Dios y su obra de salvación, sino permanecer en un nivel mas superficial del uso del lenguaje. Lo cual es aplicable al tratamiento de M. de conceptos básicos de teología paulina, como «ley», a propósito de lo cual habría utilizado útilmente von Düllmen, *Die Theologie des Gesetzes bei Paulus*, y otras obras análogas.

Estas observaciones no pretenden disminuir el valor y las aportaciones de la obra, sino enmarcar su punto de vista con sus pros y contras.

Habría sido deseable mayor concisión y un ceñirse más al tema. Así las pags. 117-194 están consagradas a las interpretaciones del siglo primero sobre la promesa de Dios a Abraham para compararlas con la visión paulina de este tema. El intento es interesante, pero ¿no podría haberse hecho más breve o remitirlo a otro lugar? De hecho desvía la atención.

En resumen, una obra interesante por la aplicación de criterios y perspectivas recientes a antiguos puntos de teología paulina.

Universidad Pontificia Comillas
Cantoblanco
Madrid 34

Federico PASTOR-RAMOS

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Franciscan Holy Land Archeologists in Rome

From April 27 to 30, 1982, the Friars Minor organized in the Antonianum a noteworthy pictorial display and corolla of excavation reports. Six of the most active younger field-archeologists of the Holy Land Custody discussed Capernaum, Machaerus, Calvary repairs, and results for exegesis and earliest Palestine Christianity. The general title, "Thirty Years of Archaeology in the Holy Land" gradually evolved into "The First Christian Generations in Palestine and East-Jordan". "Archeological achievements set forth by protagonists" is the title of Gino CONCETTI on p. 1 of the April 26 Osservatore Romano; while in *Vita Minorum* 53 (1982) 4 will appear a longer report by Luigi ORLANDO, with which we have been able to supplement our first-hand observations.

In his welcoming address, Antonianum Rector Gerardo CARDAROPOLI noted that "Demythologizing, structuralism, secularization have become so prominent in our time that our hermeneutic needs the realist corrective of archeology and history. The most sophisticated literary analysis falls silent before the voice of the stones". Then for the sponsorship of this meeting he thanked the Custos Maurilio SACCHI and his successor Ignazio MANCINI, as well as the longtime leader of Franciscan archeology Bellarmino BAGATTI.

Stanislao LOFFREDA thereupon made a first declaration in his capacity as director of the Jerusalem Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SBF). He spoke of "a special way of studying the Bible" upon the soil of the Holy Land. In its half-century of existence the SBF has produced a hundred volumes already. It is the only institute in the whole Middle East that can grant the [Catholic] doctorate in biblico-archeological studies. LOFFREDA too expressed indebtedness to the Custody authorities.

Capernaum. Virgilio CORBO next presented: "Capernaum the city of Jesus". The *insulae* or blocks of dwellings which he excavated there since 1968 accentuate the intensely *clan*-organization of village life. The doorways were never closed, but wide open, without doors. The sleeping-room of Insula II was long and narrow. No bath or toilet was found.

The "house of Peter[*'s* mother-in-law]", underneath the actual mosaic-octagon, was occupied by a very numerous clan. This became the permanent dwelling of Jesus; the actual room was identified at an outside corner, left of the entrance. [There was not time enough to indicate the archeological proofs of this assertion for the somewhat general audience; privately Corbo assured me that the proofs were clear enough in his volume on Capernaum, though not noticed by FERRUA in his *Civiltà Cattolica* review, nor indeed by me in *Bib* 58 (1977) 425].

At the synagogue-site Corbo has made 25 trenches, in three levels. At the top, "C", is the white-stone synagogue known to all pilgrims: 350-450 A.D. as proved by coins and pottery. The lowest stratum "A" was an insula, which had been destroyed early in the Roman period. Why? The answer depends on "B", the big public building made of basalt which stood *under* "The Synagogue" and had seemed to have no relation to it. It was built in the first century A.D. From his re-reading of Peter the Deacon (probably quoting Egeria) CORBO is now disposed to maintain that the basalt-building is actually the synagogue built by the centurion of Luke 7,5.

Further points of interest noted by CORBO in his slides: There were three clans in Insula II (between Peter's House and the synagogue). All the windows looked only inside on the courtyard. In the ash of the hearths were dating-criteria sherds. A tetradrachma of Caracalla unique in the whole world was found quite near the "room of Jesus". Also in the house of Peter was a wall frescoed with flowers and geometric patterns, but also one with an *incision* of a boat with a sail. There were some estrangelo graffiti elsewhere. Thirty thousand coins are already available for dating Synagogue C; others are still imbedded in the cement. If we are to say that the basalt building is the Centurion's synagogue, there are still some problems; for example, no door was found; but that was true also of Magdala synagogue. Very interesting were the small staircases which CORBO showed *inside* the houses, leading to a kind of mezzanine roof very suggestive of Mark 2,4, especially with the help of a vivid reconstruction-model shown in a slide.

The PICCIRILLO Display. Michele PICCIRILLO was the principal organizer of the meeting and its pictorial display, which occupied the two large ante-rooms of the Aula Magna. To the left of the audience was the historic Nebo excavation, first of the SBF; also Dominus Flevit, with a pre-David Jebusite tomb of Mycenaean and Egyptian connections, as well as the famous graffiti of the Roman period; further Nazareth, Capernaum, Bethany; and materials from Corbo's three-volume work on the Holy Sepulchre now in the press. On the audience's right were the minor excavation views, and also an interesting history of the Museum founded in 1902; it holds remarkable medieval art from Bethlehem; and especially the coins (sheqels from Dominus Flevit and Herodium) in which A. SPIJKERMAN specialized during his term as director. Available to all was the elegantly illustrated catalogue of the two-room display, PICCIRILLO's *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, attività storico-archeologiche ed esegetiche* (Jerusalem 1982; 81 p.).

The second day was begun with a philological study of the term "house" in its relation to the Capernaum discoveries, by Angelo LANCELOTTI. A pre-redactional stratum of the Synoptics suffices to show that Jesus had a genuine "permanent home" in Capernaum, and indeed in Peter's house. The redactional stratum, chiefly in Mark, shows the "house" not only as a "place" where the nucleus of the future messianic community was gathered and formed, but also as a concrete pre-Resurrection "domus-ecclesia".

Machaerus. Director LOFFREDA presented the results of four campaigns at Mišnaqa-Mukawer in Transjordan, begun in 1978 by CORBO and continued by PICCIRILLO and himself. A large part of the work inevitably consisted in

establishing correlations with the ample descriptions of Josephus Flavius. Loffreda correlated these also with Mark 6,17.29; Matt 11,2; though the Gospels do not name Machaerus.

The Primitive Palestine Church. Frédéric MANNS spent some time on four preliminary observations: (1) archeology has its *own* method, and the study of historical (literary) sources is *different*, but the very effort to make *bridges* between them tends to complicate an already complex situation; and can hardly escape the danger of *apologetic* aims. (2) To this day no satisfactory definition of "Judeo-Christianity" has been found; though Baur's Hegelianism is considered abandoned, it has left many question-marks behind; in this inquiry there must be a kind of pluralism, not excluding any aspect. (3) The moment for big syntheses has not yet come; important sites like Sion, Bethsaida, Sepphoris have not yet been touched. Pella, re-begun by the Australians, may help. Epiphanius' *Panarion* certainly will if it is ever critically edited. (4) Admitting the historicity of the "Flight to Pella" is fundamental to an appraisal of the Jerusalem Christian community. Bagatti has shown that the sources, though late, are reliable; and the "flight" may even be hinted in John's Gospel.

After these preliminaries, Manns made four principal points. (1) Sources: the Gospels are not a biography of Jesus but a dialogue between Christians and the rest of the Jewish community (Matt.: 'you will be scourged in their synagogues'; John: 'they tried to put him out of the synagogue'). Melito came to Jerusalem because he felt it contained the answers to his problems about the Canon; he says the Jews crucified Jesus in the *center* of the city (thus Calvary was inside the walls of Aelia as in the Madaba map); Jerusalem preserved its right to control the teaching of other cities, even Rome: just as Aqiba visited the communities of the diaspora to check on their fidelity to doctrine.

(2) BAGATTI finds in the Apocrypha information useful for the archeologist e.g. three rooms of Mary's Tomb as shown by the *Dormitio Mariae*. Such "pseudepigrapha" were eliminated from the Canon because they used haggadic methods — unacceptable after the bishops began to be of non-Jewish origin. There was a similar pluralism of views among the Jews; *Nošrim* does not always mean "Christians", sometimes Sadducees; there are references to *Minim* of Sepphoris and Capernaum, but *never* of Nazareth; Rabbi Eliezer showed great admiration for the sayings of Jesus; a rabbi was converted and his name was struck out of all documents, replaced by *aḥer* "somebody Else". Rabbinic hermeneutics coped with the number of Jewish converts to Christianity by interpreting Jonah: his pagans too only *pretended* to be converted; Jonah sat under the tree to see what would happen, and he was sad because they all eventually *returned* to paganism!

(3) After a third point on BAGATTI's finds at Dominus Flevit and Nazareth, CORBO's in Simon's house, and the Qedron tomb of Mary, MANNS gave this synthesis (4): We must distinguish the Jewish-Christians of Galilee, Samaria, and Jerusalem; and only Jerusalem is here under discussion; we must distinguish three historical periods: a) dialogue with other Jews up to 70; b) Christians no longer collaborated in the effort to repel the Romans, and were reprovved by the Jews as *Minim*; c) after Hadrian 135 the command of

the Church passed to non-Jewish Christians. Jerome says the Nazarenes gathered on Mt. Sion to celebrate the Passover; they were opposed to the Pharisees but not to Paul. M. BROSH's 1971 excavations in the Armenian quarter disprove Miss K. KENYON's claim that the Cenacle area was not inhabited until after 44. Despite Gentile-bishops, the Judeo-Christian Community remained in the Cenacle until the fourth century and were probably the Quartodecimans. Manns concluded that it is high time to update church-history manuals in view of these facts.

Nebo and Transjordan. The dynamic organizer PICCIRILLO then showed his slides of the East-Jordan area, interspersed with views of modern Arabs evoking the biblical way of life. His view of the Amman theatre showed its three tiers splendidly restored. Egeria and Peter the Iberian saw Nebo and showed that the Christians were aware of the messianic importance of East-Jordan. The Madaba Map was shown with very clear features and colors. Wadi Hesa (or? Hesed) was said to be the area's most important [but surely not more than scenic Arnon]. Among the fringe-benefits of the mosaics which PICCIRILLO is editing, we get much help to complete the lists of bishops, all suffragans of Boşra. One mosaic had four swastikas. The mosaic donors' inscriptions recall the high economic level attained by the Christian communities, ruined rather abruptly when the transfer of Arab power from Damascus to Baghdad changed the caravan routes. Current Hashemite building efforts reveal new mosaics (not always successfully protected against hurried architects), and furnish a center of stability in the area. A 'Cathedral' at Madaba so-called by its Dominican discoverer long ago, and surveyed by SCHUMACHER, turns out to be indeed an important monument.

On the fourth day, Alviero NICCACCÌ gave a useful survey of the archeological and exegetico-theological work of the SBF. The chief Franciscan service has been to fill the void which intervenes between the New Testament itself and the earliest Byzantine churches. NICCACCÌ also gave a helpful run-down on the principal Franciscan publications.

Highlight of the four days for many will have been CORBO's summation of what has been going on at Calvary basilica. Since the work is still in progress, and has meanwhile been made known in other publications (and contains no real surprises), we may conclude in subscribing to the farewell words of the Minister General of the Friars Minor, John VAUGHN: through works like these the academic and pastoral achievements of the Church are enhanced in both quality and quantity.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert NORTH S. J.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaktion nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutbefinden.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist: Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

Vetus Testamentum

Achtemeier, Elizabeth, *The Community and Message of Isaiah 56-66*. 159 p. 19,7 × 13,4. Minneapolis 1982. Augsburg.

Ascaso, Joaquín Sanmartín, *Las guerras de Josué*. Estudio de semiótica narrativa (Institución San Jerónimo 14). 229 p. 24 × 16,1. Valencia 1982.

Boadt, Lawrence, *Jeremiah 1-25* (Old Testament Message 9). xxviii-213 p. 21 × 13,3. Wilmington 1981. Michael Glazier. \$ 7.95.

Boese, Helmut, *Die Alte «Glosa Psalmorum ex Traditione Seniorum»*. Untersuchungen, Materialien, Texte. Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. Nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron (Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 9). 286 p. 24 × 16,2. Freiburg 1982. Herder.

Coggins, R - Phillips, A. - Knibb (Editors), *Israel's Prophetic Tradition*. Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd. xxi-272 p. 22 × 14,3. Cambridge 1982. Cambridge University Press. £ 21.00.

Correa, Germán, *Profetas y Salmistas*. 305 p. 21 × 16. Bogotá 1981. Universidad Santo Tomás.

Eissfeldt, Otto, *Introduzione all'Antico Testamento*. Analisi dei libri dell'Antico Testamento 2. Edizione italiana a cura di Vincenzo Gatti (Biblioteca teologica 3). 439 p. 22,6 × 15,8. Brescia 1982. Lit. 25.000.

Emerton, J. A. - Reif, S. C., (Editors), *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible*. Essays in honour of E. D. J. Rosenthal. xv-318 p. 22 × 14. Cambridge 1982. Cambridge University Press. £ 22.50.

Engberg, Gudrun, Ed., *Prophetologium*. Pars altera: lectiones anni immobilis. Fasciculus primus textum continens. xvi-191 p. 26,3×18,5. Fasciculus alter apparatus criticum continens. p. 198-311 (Union Académique Internationale. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae. Lectionaria, Vol. I). Copenhagen 1981. Munksgaard. DKR 122.

Englezakis, Benedict, *New and Old in God's Revelation*. Studies in Relations Between Spirit and Tradition in the Bible. 122 p. 22×14. Cambridge - Crestwood, NY, 1982. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press. £ 9.95.

Falk, Marcia, *Love Lyrics from the Bible*. A Translation and Literary Study of The Song of Songs (Bible and Literature Series 4). 152 p. 21,5×13,5. Sheffield 1982. The Almond Press. £ 5.95.

Fontaine, Carole R., *Traditional Sayings in the Old Testament*. A Contextual Study (Bible and Literature Series 5) 280 p. 21,5×13,5. Sheffield 1982. The Almond Press £ 8.95.

Gargano, Guido-Innocenzo, *La teoria di Gregorio di Nissa sul Cantico dei Cantici*. Indagine su alcune indicazioni di metodo esegetico (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 216). 262 p. 24×17. Roma 1981. Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium.

Hunter, A. Vanlier, *Seek the Lord*. A Study of the Meaning and Function of the Exhortations in Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and Zephaniah (Dissertation). 324 p. 22,8×15,7. Baltimore 1982. St. Mary's Seminary & University.

Knight, D. A. (et alii), *Tradition et théologie dans l'Ancien Testament* (Lectio Divina 108). 358 p. 21,5×13,5. Paris 1982. Cerf - Desclée. FF 140.

Krantz, Eva Strömberg, *Des Schiffes Weg mitten im Meer*. Beiträge zur Erforschung der nautischen Terminologie des Alten Testaments (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 19). 225 p. 22,3×15,7. Lund 1982. CWK Gleerup. SEK 80.

Lepre, Cesare, *Il libro di Ruth*. 187 p. 23,7×16,7. Napoli 1982. M. D'Auria Editore. Lit. 24.000.

Mangan, Celine, *1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (Old Testament Message 13). viii-219 p. 21×13,3. Wilmington 1982. Michael Glazier. \$ 7.95.

Montagnini, Felice, *Il libro di Isaia*. Parte prima (capp. 1-39) (Studi Biblici 58). 257 p. 20,7×13,7. Brescia 1982. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 9.000.

Tal, Abraham, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch*. A Critical Edition. Part II, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, Volume V). 339 p. 24,4×17,5. Tel-Aviv 1981. Tel-Aviv University.

Ruppert, L. – Weimar, P. – Zenger, E., (Hrsg.), *Künder des Wortes*. Beiträge zur Theologie der Propheten. 336 S. 14 × 22,5. Würzburg 1982. Echter. DM 48.

Seebass, Horst, *Der Gott der ganzen Bibel*. Biblische Theologie zur Orientierung im Glauben. 256 p. 22 × 14,5. Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1982. Herder. DM 38.

Van der Wal, *Planten uit de Bijbel*. Een systematische literatuurlijst. viii-66 p. 20,5 × 14,5. Amsterdam 1982. VU Boekhander/Uitgeverij. Gld 9,50.

Weingreen, J., *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. 98 p. 21,5 × 14,4. Oxford – New York 1982. Clarendon Press – Oxford University Press. £ 5.50.

Westermann, Claus, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*. Trans. by K. R. Crim and R. N. Soulen. 301 p. 20 × 13,6. Edinburg 1981. T. & T. Clark. £ 4.95.

Westermann, Claus, *Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament*. Traduction Michel Epstein (Lire la Bible 59). 136 p. 11,5 × 18,1. Paris 1982. Cerf. FF 48.

Novum Testamentum

Derrett, J. Duncan M., *The Anastasis: The Resurrection of Jesus as an Historical Event*. xiv-166 p. 20,5 × 22,7. Warwickshire 1982. P. Drinkwater, Publisher. £ 5.

Friburg, Barbara – Friberg, Timothy, (Ed.), *Analytical Greek New Testament* [The complete text of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament with an interlinear analysis of each word]. xv-854 p. 23,5 × 16. Grand Rapids, MI 1982. Baker Book House. \$ 19.95.

Fleinert-Jensen, Flemming, *Commentaire de la Première Épître de Jean* (Lire la Bible 56). 144 p. 18 × 11,4. Paris 1982. Le Cerf. 40 FF.

Fusco, Vittorio, *Parola e Regno*. La sezione delle parabole (Mc 4,1-34) nella prospettiva marcana (Aloisiana. Pubblicazioni della Pontificia Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia Meridionale. Sezione «S. Luigi» Napoli 13). Brescia 1980. Morcelliana. Lit. 15.000.

Klauch, Hans-Josef, *Herrenmahl und Hellenistischer Kult*. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Neue Folge 15). viii-431 p. 24 × 14. Münster 1982. Aschendorff.

Pardilla, Angel, *La figura bíblica del Apóstol*. 173 p. 17 × 24. Roma 1982. Edición del autor.

Pollard, T. E., *Fullness of Humanity*. Christ's Humanness and Ours (The Croall Lectures, 1980). 126 p. 21,5×13,5. Sheffield 1982. The Almond Press. £ 5.95.

Schweizer, Eduard, *Die Bergpredigt* (Kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe 1481). 19×11,5. 118 S. Göttingen 1982. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 10,80.

Suh, Chul Won, *The Creation-Mediatorship of Jesus Christ*. A Study in the Relation of the Incarnation and the Creation (Amsterdam Studies in Theology IV). 325 p. 22×15. Amsterdam 1982. Rodopi B.V. Gld 60,00.

Varia

Békés G. J. - Meyer, H., (Editors), *Confessio Fidei*. International Ecumenical Colloquium. Rome, 3-8 November 1980 (Studia Anselmiana 81, Sacramentum 7). 174 p. 24,2×17. Roma 1982. Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo.

Friedman, Mordechai Akiva, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine*. A Cairo Geneza Study. Volume I, The Ketubba Traditions of Eretz Israel. xxiv-492 p. Volume II, The Ketubba Texts. ix-517 p. 22,7×16,5. Tel-Aviv - New York 1980. Tel-Aviv University - The Jewish Theological Seminary of America. \$ 15,00, each volume.

Falanga, Lorenzo, *La croce di Ercolano*. Cronistoria di una scoperta (Quaderni dell'associazione per lo studio e la divulgazione dell'archeologia biblica 2). xiv-127 p. 23,7×16,5. Napoli 1981. M. D'Auria Editore.

Gribomont, Jean, *Commentaria in S. Regulam* (Studia Anselmiana 84). 143 p. 24,2×12. Roma 1982. Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo.

Gil, Moshe, *The Tustaris, Family and Sect* (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute 39). 115 p. 21,4×13,8. Tel-Aviv 1981. The Haim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies. Tel-Aviv University.

Junod, Eric - Kaestli, J. D., *L'histoire des Actes Apocryphes des Apôtres du III^e au IX^e siècle: Le cas des Actes de Jean* (Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 7). 154 p. 22,8×15,4. Genève - Lausanne - Neuchâtel 1982. Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie. Fr s. 33.—

Montalban/II. 891 p. 23×15,3. Caracas 1981. Universidad Católica Andrés Bello. Facultad de Humanidades y Educación.

Rochat R., - Tridente, A., - Genre, E., *Costruire la pace oggi*. Relazioni, interventi e documenti del Campo invernale di Agape (Prati) (26/12/1981 - 1/1/1982) (Dossier 15). 189 p. 19,8×12. Torino 1982. Claudiana. Lit. 5.600.

Varone, Antonio, *Presenze giudaiche e cristiana a Pompei* (Quaderni della società per lo studio e la divulgazione dell'archeologia biblica 1). ix-119 p. 25,5×17,7. Napoli 1979. M. D'Auria Editore.

Yeo, Richard, *The Structure and Content of Monastic Profession*. A juridical study, with particular regard to the practice of the English Benedictine Congregation since the French Revolution (Studia Anselmiana 83). 360 p. 24,2 × 17. Roma 1982. Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo.

Macuch, Rudolf, *Grammatik des Samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Studia Samaritana IV). LXXII-427 p. 24,1 × 15,5. Berlin - New York 1982. Walter de Gruyter.

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA - Settembre 1982